JAIMINĪYA BRĀHMAṆA

I, 1–65

1–2. *Agnyādhāna, agnihotra and cremation*

The connection between these three subjects is explained in *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra* (abbreviated as *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*), ch. III. For the identity of the fires and the vital powers, of the oblation and food see o.c., ch. III and IV. Part of the passage on the cremation occurs also JB. 1, 47 in the purely ritualistic, sūtra-like description of the funeral rites. In the present context the mantra *asmād vai tvam* .. excellently establishes the connection between the agnyādhāna and the cremation. The relationship between these two is also found ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 1 ff. and VādhS. 3, 4 (*A.O.* 4, p. 8). The corresponding passage in 1, 47 seems to be less original and may have been taken from 1, 2. The last sentence of 1, 47 hardly fits the ritualistic context and is more suitable in 1, 1-2, where the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the agnihotra is given. The (actually performed) agnihotra is viewed as an *ātmayajña* in accordance with the interpretation of that term by ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13, where *sa ṛṅmayo yajurmayaḥ sāmamaya āhutimayaḥ svargaṃ lokam abhisambhavati* forms a striking parallel of JB. 1, 2 *so 'ta āhutimayo manomayaḥ prāṇamayaḥ* (..) *ṛṅmayo yajurmayas sāmamayo brahmamayo hiraṇmayo 'mṛtas saṃbhavati*. On this concept of *ātmayajña* in which not some external gods, but the sacrificer's self (the internal deity or deities) forms the object of the rite see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. IX, n. 35 ff.

1. Here now they say: "What does he offer, in what there is offered?". He offers life, in (the) life(breath)[1] there is offered. In that here they churn out the fires, thereby they produce the sacrificer's lifebreaths.[2] Therefore he holds his breath during the churning out.[3] His lifebreaths are all that time in the two pieces of kindling wood.

While it (the lower piece of kindling wood) is churned (by the upper *araṇi*) some borings come off.[4] This is his food that is produced. "Here my food has been produced" thus he should consider it. Thereupon smoke whirls up.[5] This is his mind[6] that is produced. "Here my mind has been produced" thus he should consider it. Then (a glowing spot of) charcoal is engendered (in the lower *araṇi*). This is his sight that is produced. "Here my sight has been produced" thus he should consider it. This charcoal swallows those borings. As a child right after its birth reaches out for the breast, so it creeps about in all directions.[7] This is his hearing[8] that is produced. "Here my hearing has been produced" thus he should consider it. He (the priest) shakes some grassblades (as a fan) over the fire. This[9] is his

breath that is produced. "Here[9] my breath has been produced" thus he should consider it. (The fire) flames up making the sound *bhāḥ*. This is his speech[10] that is produced. "Here my speech has been produced" thus he should consider it.

He produces for himself these five lifebreaths. Having threefoldly[11] divided them and having made them divine powers[12] he keeps offering in them (for the rest of his life). Gods indeed are his divine (vital) powers *(devāḥ)*.[12] These are *devāḥ* for him because he keeps offering in (and to) them.[13]

2. Now, as to what they say: "What does he offer, in what there is offered?" (the answer should be that) he offers life[14] and in (the) life(breath) there is offered. It is therefore food which he offers in the lifebreath. He does not die against his will[15] for he strengthens these lifebreaths by offering in them.[16] Moreover the oblation is the brahmin's Ego.[17] This he places in his own body, in these immortal lifebreaths. This being placed in his own body does not perish.

Now when[18] the mind passes away, when the breath, sight, hearing, then it enters these fires. Thereupon they throw after (these lifebreaths) also this body of his in these fires (reciting) "From him thou wert born, he should be born out of thee, *svāhā*".[19] He (arises) from this (fire)[20] and becomes immortal in the form of an oblation, mind, breath, sight, hearing, speech, *ṛc*, *yajus*, *sāman*, *brahman* and gold.[21] His lifebreaths become immortal. He makes for himself an immortal body here (i.e. in the agnyādhāna and agnihotra ritual). He becomes immortal who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

[1] Here *prāṇa* seems to denote the totality of the *prāṇāḥ*. On the several significations of *prāṇa* and *prāṇāḥ* see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III. I translate the plural with "breaths", when the series *prāṇa*, *apāna* etc. is meant, and with "lifebreaths" or "vital powers", when *prāṇa* occurs together with *vāc*, *manas* etc. These lifebreaths, named after the one that is taken as the most essential, are sometimes misinterpreted as senses, organs of sense etc. It is true that the *prāṇāḥ* may denote the orifices of the head, but mostly the powers behind these together with other vital powers are meant. See also O. H. de A. Wijesekara, "Upaniṣadic terms for sense-functions", *Univ. Ceylon Review* 2 (nov. 1944). The lifebreaths are vital powers or manifestations of life within the body which distinguish living beings from the dead and from unanimated objects. Mostly the agnyādhāna symbolizes the laying of the other series of *prāṇāḥ* in the sacrificer's self, but here the churning out of the fire is described as producing the five lifebreaths, which at the end of this chapter are said to be identical to the three sacred fires. So offering in the established fires means offering in the *prāṇāḥ* or in the *prāṇa* as the totality

of the lifebreaths. On this *adhyātmam* approach of the actually performed agnihotra and its connection with the prāṇāgnihotra see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* (especially ch. III).

[2] According to ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 14 f. the churned fire is the sacrificer's breath. By breathing upon it he confirms the identity of breath and fire (and kindles it). Thereupon he inhales the fire and places it in his self. According to Ewing, "The Hindu conception of the functions of breath", *J.A.O.S.* 22, p. 285 f., he first inhales and then breathes out. This is untenable as is in general his interpretation of *prāṇa* as the inbreathing. KŚS. 4, 8, 26 f. stating *tasyābhiśvāsaḥ prāṇam amṛte dadha iti/ucchvāso 'mṛtaṃ prāṇe ādadha iti* proves Eggeling's interpretation to be correct. JB. deals with the lifebreaths and not with the breaths. But in the next sentence, where reference is made to holding the breath, we may find a relic of the more current equation of fires and breaths.

[3] The sacrificer holds his breath in order to symbolize the absence of breath or life before the production of the fire. The *manthana* gives him a new life. He is born at the agnyādhāna (MS. 1, 6, 4). Notice, however, that the practical aspect may also play a role: *ato yāny anyāni vīryavanti karmāṇi yathā gner manthanam ajeḥ saraṇaṃ dṛḍhasya dhanuṣa āyamanam aprāṇann anapānaṃs tāni karoti* (ChU. 1, 3, 5).

[4] This sentence has been misunderstood by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 121 (see also his "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *Journal of Vedic Studies* 1935, p. 90): "Of this (fire) as it is being churned out the ashes fall down". Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra "Studies in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa", *A.O.* 22, p. 56 follow this translation. The following objections can be raised towards such an interpretation. First one has to supply "fire", which indeed was mentioned three sentences before but there it occurred in the plural. Moreover ashes are the product of combustion rather than of churning fire. In the following context a very detailed description is given of the process of inflammation. First *bhasma* falls off, thereupon *(anu)* smoke comes forth, thereupon *(anu)* glowing charcoal. This glowing charcoal is nourished by the *bhasmāni* and after being fanned produces a fire. How could *bhasma* in this context mean ashes? What we need here is "borings (bore-dust)", the product of the erosive churning in the lower *araṇi* which is inflamed by the glowing wood of that *araṇi* (the *aṅgārāḥ* as the text calls it). The *Petr. Dict.* and Monier-Williams do not support my rendering of *bhasma*, but compare Caland's translation "faeces" (JB. 1, 127; *JB. Auswahl*, p. 32) which, though likewise without parallels from the dictionaries, is the only possible interpretation in the context. Mayrhofer, *Etym. Wörterb. d. Altind.* II, p. 490 does not accept the connection with *bhas-* "to chew, consume", but adopts the dubious explanation proposed by Thieme, *Festschrift Schubring*, p. 8, who derives *bhasman-* from *bhas-* "to blow" and supposes that *bhasma* is the place on which one blows in order to poke up the fire at daybreak. From this basic meaning the signification "ashes" would have developed. Mayrhofer, however, agrees that "die konkurrierende Verbindung mit *bhas-* "kauen" könnte allenfalls für sich in Anspruch nehmen, dass zu dieser Sippe einige Wörter für "Sand, Staub" [~"Äsche"?] gehören". See also Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, p. 35 f. The derivation from *bhas-* "to chew, consume" easily explains every shade of meaning of *bhasma* as "product of demolition": ashes, faeces, borings, dust, etc. are products of combustion, digestion, churning or boring, erosion etc. For *bhasma* as the erosion produced by rivers on the mountains see Rām. (Bombay ed.) 2, 63, 19 [= crit. ed. II, p. 339 crit. app.]: *pāndurāruṇavarṇāni srotāṃsi vimalyāny api susruvur giridhātu-*

bhyaḥ sabhasmāni bhujaṃgavat. The meaning "dust" also occurs in compounds (*bhasmatūlam* "shower of dust"; *bhasmameha* "a sort of gravel"). The sacred ashes used in the ritual mostly are not the product of combustion, but are taken from cowdung. See Mrs. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati* I (Pondichéry 1963), p. 30 f. (mentioning a popular etymology of *bhasma* beside the accepted one). Perhaps this cowdung is called *bhasma* as being pulverized rather than as being a product of digestion (as in JB. 1, 127). For *bhasma* meaning "dust" or "powder" compare also the derivatives in R. L. Turner, *A Compar. Dict. of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, Fasc. VII (Oxford 1965), p. 537 (i.a. referring to Kashmiri *bas* "fine dust or powder (of charcoal, fuel, cowdung, & c.)"). See also *P.T.S. Pali-English Dict.* s.v. *bhasman.*

[5] If the text reading *ninardati* ("to slur or trill" referring to chanting of sāmans) is sound, the auditive impression is transferred here to a visual impression (trilling of smoke). There are no parallels, but the *Petr. Dict.* mentions the meaning "to move" (lexic.).

[6] Mostly *manas* is connected with the moon, sometimes (e.g. ChU. 3, 13) also with rain *(parjanya)*. The identification in this passage with smoke has to be explained in the context of the water doctrine (see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B), which teaches that out of the smoke of the sacrificial (or funeral) fire rain is produced in heaven and sent down every half-month by the moon. So smoke, moon and rain belong together.

[7] The glowing charcoal (i.e. that spot in the lower *araṇi* where the wood starts glowing as a result of the friction) creeps about in all directions *(tiryaṅ visarpati)*, i.e. it spreads "eating" the borings around that spot. The *tertium comparationis* is not the creeping, but the eating, the first action of a child and a newly produced fire.

[8] Hearing *(śrotram)* is frequently equated with the quarters. The creeping about in all directions *(vi sarpati)*, i.e. the spatial extension (the quarters represent space as the seasons represent time in Vedic India), is compared to hearing.

[9] I.e. the wind produced by the fanning. Wind and *prāṇa* are usually identified. The pronouns *sa* and *eṣa (prāṇa evāsya s a jāyate/ prāṇo ma eṣo 'jani)* indicate that indeed a subject like wind should be referred to and that *tad* and *etad* in the preceding sentences are not adverbial, but are congruent with the neuter nouns *annam, manas* etc. (whereas *tat* is an adverb in *tad yad etad agnīn manthanti ... tat prāṇān janayanti*).

[10] Speech and fire form a current equation. For *bhāḥ* cf. JB. 1, 294 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 118) *sā* (sc. the cow) *bārhatīṃ vācaṃ vadati bhā iti.*

[11] For the connection between three lifebreaths or vital powers (and not breaths) with the three sacrificial fires compare VādhS. 3, 1 (*A.O.* 4, p. 6 f.).

[12] The vital powers are sometimes called *devāḥ*. See O. H. de A. Wijesekara, whose view (o.c., p. 15) that "With the growing tendency in the Upaniṣads to regard *manas* as one of the sense-functions, in fact as the sense-function *par excellence*, the term *deva* is extended by analogy to apply to other cognitive and conative senses in the human body" lays too much stress on the sense-functions of the *prāṇāḥ* and on *manas*. The life-aspect seems to be more important (*prāṇa* does not always represent smell among the vital powers). Moreover *prāṇa*, already very early a central conception, did not need the analogy of *manas* to be called divine. As life-potencies these *prāṇāḥ* are immortal, are gods. Being gods they receive the oblations as deities. One offers (by way of the fires with whom they are homologized) in or rather to the *prāṇāḥ*, the internal deities.

[13] The external gods are replaced by internal gods. This sacrificer is no longer a *devayājin*, but an *ātmayājin*. The self of the sacrificer becomes the object of the rite (see on the *ātmayajña* interpretation of the actually performed śrauta sacrifice ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13). Moreover this final sentence of 1, 1 seems to explain why the vital powers are called *devāḥ*. One offers symbolically in or to the *prāṇāḥ*. According to ŚB. 9, 4, 2, 15 one makes someone a deity *(devatā)* by an oblation.

[14] In the first chapter the offering in the *prāṇa* has been explained. The second chapter deals with the offering of *prāṇa*. In fact food is offered in *prāṇa*, but since the effect of this food-offering (actually the agnihotra oblation) means that life is maintained and strengthened, one may say that life *(prāṇa)* is offered; that life is added to life. So food means life, a not unusual identification. Cf. ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 1, 6: "He takes out (material for an oblation) to Agni Pavamāna (the Blowing). Now the blowing one is breath, so that he thereby puts breath into him (the sacrificer). And this he puts into him by means of this (offering); for breath means food and this offering also is food" (tr. Eggeling). Cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 25, 13: "The repetition of *o* is food; the breaths are food; the Śilpas are the breaths; verily thus he places the breath in the breaths" (tr. Keith).

[15] Read *'nakāmamāra imān* ... (ms. ra *nakāmāmāra imān...*) instead of *'nnaṃ kāmayamāna imān* ... For *anakāmamāra* (Monier-Williams: "not killing undesiredly"; but cf. Schmidt's *Nachträge* on the concise *Petr. Dict.*: "deutlicher: vor unerwünschtem Tode schützend") see AĀ. 2, 3, 8; KhādGS. 4, 1, 18 (19) and especially GobhGS. 4, 6, 1 (ed. Cintamani Bhattacharya, Calcutta 1936) with Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's bhāṣya, which clearly shows that the compound refers to the not dying against one's will. For the general idea cf. also ŚāṅkhĀ. 11, 6 *mā 'ham akāmo mariṣyāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsaṃ svāhā*, where the ritualism reminds us of the prāṇāgnihotra and of the agnihotra speculations as found in our text.

[16] This conception of the strengthening of the *prāṇāḥ* is also current in the prāṇāgnihotra.

[17] I read with ms. la[2] *svaṃ yad* instead of *svar yad*. Whitney's transcript reads *svaryard* with v.l. *svaṃryyard*. Veda Vyasa's specimen pages have *svar yad*. The manuscript of this specimen edition, sent to Caland as enclosures of a letter dated 9 aug. 1928, contains Caland's correction *svaṃ* for *svar* (which indeed hardly makes sense in the context). Perhaps, however, *svam* here does not mean "Ego", but "property, wealth".

[18] From here to the end of this chapter cf. Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 106 n. 7.

[19] The same formula *(asmād vai tvam ajāyathā eṣa tvaj jāyatāṃ svāhā)* is found JB. 1, 47 and with some slight differences KauśS. 81, 30; ĀśvGS. 4, 3, 27. Cf. also VS. 35, 22; ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 15; TĀ. 6, 1, 24; 6, 2, 3; 6, 4, 12; KŚS. 25, 7, 38; ŚŚS. 4, 14, 36. The fire which was produced by the sacrificer at the agnyādhāna should now in turn cause the sacrificer to be born in heaven. See the introd. to this section.

[20] Presumably *ataḥ* here means "therefrom, from the fire(s) in which he is cremated". In the parallel passage of 1, 47 *ataḥ* can hardly have this meaning, as the immediate context does not refer to the actual cremation. For the whole sentence cf. AB. 1, 22, 15; JB. 3, 340; ŚB. 4, 3, 4, 5; 10, 5, 1, 5; 11, 2, 6, 13. See also ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 13 (funeral ritual) *tāṃ vā etām / yajamānātmāhutim antato juhoti sa yo 'sya svarge loko jito bhavati tata āhutimayo 'mṛtaḥ sambhavati* (JB. *so 'ta āhutimayo ... 'mṛtas saṃbhavati*).

[21] For *hiraṇmaya-* cf. AĀ. 2, 1, 3; ŚB. 10, 1, 4, 9. Gold symbolizes immortality.

3–4. *The agnihotra a reduced great sacrifice. Equation of the agnihotra with soma sacrifices*

After the section on the agnyādhāna which forms the foundation of the agnihotra the text continues with a myth on the origin of the rite in which, as usual, Prajāpati plays a role. Prajāpati's thousand-year *sattra* is ultimately reduced to the one-day agnihotra by the gods. For this passage cf. ṢaḍvB. 4, 2 (ed. Sharma 5, 2) *prajāpatir vā etat sattraṃ sahasrasaṃvatsaram asṛjata* (JB. *prajāpatis sahasrasaṃvatsaram āsta*). In the ṢaḍvB. passage, which looks like an abridged version, Prajāpati reduces this sacrifice successively to the *gavāmayana, dvādaśāha, atirātra, ṣoḍaśin, ukthya, agniṣṭoma, iṣṭi* and *paśubandha* and ultimately to the *agnihotra (teṣāṃ prajāpatiḥ sahasrasaṃvatsaraṃ gavāmayane 'vārundhat / gavāmayanaṃ dvādaśāhe ..*) without any explanation of the motive of this abridgement, whereas in JB. the gods themselves reduce the thousand-year sacrifice as being too long for human beings. In ṢaḍvB. *teṣām* should refer to the gods according to the commentary, but in the direct context no gods are mentioned. ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 5 *teṣāṃ prajāpatiḥ sadyoyajñasaṃsthām upaiti* should, however, presumably be connected with 4, 2 (the one-day sacrifice being the agnihotra). One might be under the impression that the composition of the agnihotra section is corrupt. The expiations of ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 7-8 have no relation with the agnihotra, as was already observed by Eelsingh in his introduction to the ṢaḍvB. ed. (thesis Utrecht 1908), p. XXI; XXX; XXXII. Moreover 4, 1, 16 *sarvair ha vā etasya yajñakratubhir iṣṭaṃ bhavati / ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti* is repeated at the end of 4, 2, 1. Probably this sentence originally should only conclude the equations of the agnihotra with other great sacrifices (4, 1, 6; 4, 1, 9-11; 4, 1, 15). The repetition after the Prajāpati myth may be an indication that the original position of these equations was after the myth which explains the agnihotra as the essence of all sacrifices. This original situation is indeed found in JB., where strikingly the very systematical identification of agnihotra and other sacrifices (1, 4) is concluded with *(yad ete sāyam/prātarāhutī juhoty etābhyām evāsyāhutibhyāṃ) sarvair etair yajñakratubhir iṣṭaṃ bhavati*. The original text of ṢaḍvB. reconstructed so far should be 4, 1, 5; 4, 2, 1; 4, 1, 6; 4, 1, 9-11; 4, 1, 15-16. The paragraphs before 4, 1, 5 deal with the coming into being of the Puruṣa, which is identified with sacrifice (the same sacrifice which is reduced to the agnihotra?). ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 3 and JB. 1, 3 show a striking resemblance

ṢaḍvB. *(te devāḥ prajāpatim upādhāvan) veda śarīrair vā idam*
JB. *(te 'bruvan) deva śarīrair vā idam*
ṢaḍvB. *amṛtaśarīr am na ha vā idaṃ mṛtyoḥ*
JB. *amṛtaśarīr ais samāpāma na vā idaṃ manuṣyās*
ṢaḍvB. *samāpsy ateti (a iti)*
JB. *samāpsy anti*

Bollée's translation: "The gods resorted to Prajāpati thinking: this body of "immortality" (or: immortal body) shall not together with the bodies of the Vedas (, the fires,) be reached by death" reproduces the interpretation of the commentary (whose value is low; see Eelsingh, o.c., p. XXXI ff.) rather than the brāhmaṇa itself. E.g. *samāpsyata* cannot be correct. The translation does not take account of the double *idam*. The wrong interpretation (or rather the corruption of the text) forces the commentary to take the next sentence *(te 'bruvan ko nāmāsīti)* as meaning *sa puruṣaḥ konāmakaḥ khalv āsety evaṃ prajāpatim abruvan* and Bollée does so without observing that he has departed from the printed text. It may be assumed that ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 3 up to *samāpsyateti* forms a corrupt insertion. ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 2 describes how the Puruṣa came into being as a result of the austerities practised by the gods. Directly after 4, 1, 2 the question of the gods (to that Puruṣa and not to Prajāpati) *ko nāmāsi* should follow. The corruption of the sentence which forms the parallel of JB. 1, 3 may be the result of an attempt to make the insertion agree with its new context (in which the Vedas indeed play a role). The original version of *mṛtyoḥ* may have been *martyāḥ*, which might imply that JB. (reading *manuṣyās)* was not the source.

ṢaḍvB. seems to combine a myth on the origin of sacrifice (the Puruṣa is *yajña*) with the reduction of the primeval sacrifice to the agnihotra (i.e. a myth on the origin of this rite) in order to emphasize the importance of the agnihotra as the essence of the very first sacrifice. For equations of the agnihotra with other, impressive sacrifices as found in JB. 1, 4 and in the ṢaḍvB. parallel see also JB. 1, 38; 1, 40; AB. 5, 28; ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 17 ff.; TB. 2, 1, 5, 1 ff.; 2, 3, 7; etc.

3. Prajāpati performed a sacrificial session of a thousand years. Having completed seven hundred years he gained that victory which is his here.[1] Ascending to the heavenly world he spoke to the gods: "Bring ye to an end those (remaining) three hundred years". "So be it" (they said). Having completed the three hundred years they gained the same as Prajāpati had gained. They all together, this one, that one and the other one,[2] had only as much power as Prajāpati (alone). They said: "We have brought this (sacrifice) to an end with our divine, immortal bodies; forsooth the human beings will not complete this.[3] Come, let us contract[4] this sacrifice". They contracted it to the year-sacrifice.[5] They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it". They contracted it to the twelve-day session. They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it". They contracted it to the *pṛṣṭhya* six-day. They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it".

4. They contracted it to the *trirātra*, the *dvirātra*, the *āptoryāma*, the *atirātra*, the *vājapeya*, the *ṣoḍaśin*, the *ukthya*, the *agniṣṭoma*, the

iṣṭi and the *paśurbandha*, the *caturmāsyas*, the full and new moon sacrifices and the two (daily) agnihotra libations. Further than this (agnihotra) it was not subdued. Therefore the agnihotra is unsurpassed. Not overcome is he who knows thus.

When[6] he[7] touches water[8] before (offering the oblation) — water is truth, the *dīkṣā* is truth[9] — then that is his *dīkṣā*[10]. "Agni is the light, the light is Agni, *svāhā*", with this eight-syllabic[11] formula he offers the oblation. Of eight syllables is the *gāyatrī*. That is the morning libation of soma.[12] He offers the second oblation reciting only in thought.[13] That is the midday libation of soma. He wipes off[14] (the spoon) and eats. That is the third libation. For that third libation is licked at as it were.[15] After (the offering of the oblation) he touches water.[16] That is his *avabhṛtha*.[17] When he offers these two evening oblations, because of these two oblations a performance is made by him of all those sacrifices.[18]And when he offers these two morning oblations, because of these two oblations a performance is made by him of all those sacrifices. Therefore this agnihotra is unlimited.[19]

NOTES

[1] *imām eva jitim ajayad yāsyeyaṃ jitis tām.* ŚB. has in such cases (e.g. 5, 2, 3, 7) *eteno eva vyajayata yāsyeyaṃ vijitis tām.* See on this apodosis with *tām* Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 833 a. See also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 211 f.

[2] For *ta ete sarve eva prajāpatimātrā ayā3m ayā3m iti* (thus should be read, see Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra, *Studies in JB.*) cf. JUB. 1, 2, 1, 12, translated by Oertel "All these are just commensurate with Prajāpati, [of whom one may doubt:] 'Is it this one? Is it this one?'" Presumably *-mātrāḥ* indicates that the gods did not individually obtain the same result, but had to share the same portion together. The *iti* after *ayā3m ayā3m* ("this one, that one") may stand for "etc." in an uncompleted enumeration. The preceding sentence ... *tām u eva jitim ajayan yām prajāpatir ajayat* is likewise identical in both texts. In the JUB. passage Prajāpati (who wishes with regard to the gods *imāṃ vāva te jitiṃ jeṣyanti ye 'yam mama*) presses out the three Vedas. There is a very remote resemblance with the mentioned ṢaḍvB. parallel, but the agreement with JB. in these two sentences is striking.

[3] Cf. ŚB. 12, 3, 3, 5 for a substitution of the thousand-year sacrifice on behalf of man: "for what man is equal thereto that he could get through with (a performance of) a thousand years?" (tr. Eggeling). See also GB. 1, 5, 10. The thousand-year sacrifice is not reduced to the agnihotra by ŚB., but there may be some relation with the agnihotra as treated ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 1 (stating that the agnihotrins enter upon a long sacrificial session). The JB. parallel (1, 51) is not preceded in the same way by a passage on long sacrificial sessions. An indication that JB. has borrowed?

[4] Note the use of *sam-bhṛ-* with the meaning "to concentrate, contract, reduce". Are there any parallels? According to Monier-Williams *sambhṛta-*

at least may signify "concentrated", but one is under the impression that *sam-bhṛ-* mostly means "to concentrate, accumulate, collect" rather than "to concentrate, contract, condense".

[5] ṢaḍvB. 4, 2 calling the *saṃvatsara* (year-sacrifice) *gavāmayana* leaves out *pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha, trirātra, dvirātra, āptoryāma, vājapeya,* the *cāturmāsyas* and the full and new moon sacrifices in its reduction of the *sahasrasaṃvatsara.*

[6] From here to the end of this chapter the author glorifies the agnihotra by equating it with the soma ritual. See the introduction to this section. The reverse takes place VādhS. 4, 39 (*A.O.* 6, p. 151), where the soma ritual is equated with the agnihotra.

[7] Presumably the sacrificer and not the adhvaryu is the subject. The *dīkṣā* would seem to refer to the sacrificer rather than to the officiant. See n. 8 and 16. Moreover, sometimes one performs the agnihotra oneself.

[8] According to ĀpŚS. 6, 9, 3; HirŚS. 3, 7, 63 and ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 16 the officiant touches water *(apa upaspṛśya)* (before offering the libation) with the mantra *vidyud asi vidya me pāpmānam ṛtāt satyam upaimi (mayi śraddhā)* (TB. 3, 10, 9, 2). The same formula is recited by the sacrificer who sips water *(apa ācāmati)* while sitting behind the āhavanīya at the beginning of the rite (ĀpŚS. 6, 5, 3; cf. ŚSS. 2, 7, 18 and KŚS. 4, 15, 4). Remarkably BhārŚS. 6, 1, 5 (presumably referring to the sacrificer in the same situation) reads *vidyud asi* (...) *iti hoṣyann apa upaspṛśet.* "In this manner, in all sacrifices, he should touch water when he is going to perform a sacrifice and also after having performed it" (BhārŚS. 6, 1, 7; tr. Kashikar; cf. ĀpŚS. 4, 1, 7). So *apa upaspṛśati* either refers to the sacrificer who is his own priest and touches water before offering the oblation, or (more probably) to the yajamāna who sips water at the beginning of the ceremony. The ācamana formula of KŚS. 4, 15, 4 *vṛṣṭir asi vṛśca me pāpmānaṃ satyena vratam upaimy āpaḥ satyaṃ mayi vratam* perfectly suits the equation with the *dīkṣā.* The mantra is also used in the (prāṇāgnihotra) bhojanavidhi.

[9] For the identification of water and truth see e.g. KŚS. 4, 15, 4 *āpaḥ satyam* (n. 8 above). According to Naigh. 1, 12 *satyam* is *udakam.* For dīkṣā and truth cf. AB, 1, 6, 6 *ṛtaṃ vāva dīkṣā satyaṃ dīkṣā tasmād dīkṣitena satyam eva vaditavyam.*

[10] ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 6 differently homologizes an action from the agnihotra ritual with the dīkṣā: *yad gārhapatyaṃ prāduṣkaroti sā dīkṣaṇīyā.*

[11] Eightsyllabic because *svāhā* is not counted (Oertel, "JB. Roots and Verbforms", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 71).

[12] At the morning pressing gāyatrī verses are sung. Cf. JB. 1, 288.

[13] Here *manasā niṣkevalyena* contains an allusion to the *niṣkevalya śastra* which is recited at the midday pressing.

[14] For *upamṛṣṭe* cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 1, 12. JB. 1, 41 and the sūtras have the active form *upamārṣṭi.* One may assume that *upamṛṣṭe* is not asyndetically connected with *prāśnāti,* but forms an absolute locative with omitted subject (see Oertel, *Syntax,* p. 297 f.).

[15] *lelihitam iva.* The third pressing is sucked out as it were *(dhītam iva)* according to JB. 1, 156 (Caland, *Auswahl,* p. 56); 1, 288 (Caland, o.c., p. 114); 3, 295. For further parallels see Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas,* p. 53. See also ŚB. 4, 3, 3, 19.

[16] Cf. n. 8. The officiant touches water with the formula *vṛṣṭir asi vṛśca me pāpmānam ṛtāt satyam upāgām* (ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 4; ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 23 reading *apsu śraddhā* instead of *ṛtāt* .. etc.). The same mantra (with *apsu śraddhā* added) is recited by the sacrificer who sips water (ĀpŚS. 6, 14, 6). See also BhārŚS. 6, 1, 6, where the sacrificer seems to touch water with this

formula. That *apa upaspṛśati* here in the identification with the *avabhṛtha* should refer to the sacrificer who sips water appears from KŚS. 4, 15, 5 *vācaṃ visṛjya punar ācāmati vidyud asi vi me pāpmānaṃ jahy apo 'vabhṛtham abhy upaimi mayi satyaṃ goṣu me vratam iti;* ŚŚS. 2, 12, 12 *satyenāvabhṛtham abhyavaimy apsu vratam iti ācamya vācaṃ visṛjate.*

[17] See the preceding note. BŚS. 3, 7, 7 quoting TB. 2, 1, 4, 9 mentions another kind of *avabhṛtha*, viz. the pouring out of water. ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 10 and VādhS. 3, 25 (*A.O.* 4, p. 25) homologize the sacrificer's cleansing *(mārjayate)* with the *avabhṛtha.*

[18] Cf. ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 16; 4, 2, 1 *sarvair ha vā etasya yajñakratubhir iṣṭaṃ bhavati ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti.* Bollée's rendering of *sarvair* ("With complete sacrificial rites . .") is not correct. Cf. MS. 1, 8, 6: 124.18 f. *agnihotre vai sarve yajñakratavaḥ sarvān yajñakratūn avarunddhe ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti.*

[19] JB. 3, 357 *sarvaṃ ha vā idam anyat paryantavat ete ha vā aparyante yad ahorātre.* Night and day like the two performances of the agnihotra have no limitation. They always continue their alternation. Therefore the agnihotra ceremony does not have an official conclusion: *sam evānye yajñās tiṣṭhante 'gnihotram eva na saṃtiṣṭhate 'pi dvādaśasaṃvatsaram antavad evāthaitad evānantam* (ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 13); *na barhir anupraharet. asaṃsthito vā eṣa yajñaḥ yad agnihotraṃ. yad anupraharet yajñaṃ vicchindyāt* (cf. MS. 1, 8, 7: 126.8 ff. criticizing KS. 6, 8: 58.9 ff. on this *anupraharaṇa*).

5–6. *The right time for the performance of the agnihotra*

This subject is found in almost every agnihotra section. KS. 6, 5: 54. 4 f. (cf. KapS. 4, 4) and MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 9 simply state that one should offer about the time of sunset and sunrise. The later texts are involved in a discussion on the question as to whether one should offer before or after sunrise. TB. 2, 1, 2, 7 observes *yad anudite sūrye prātar juhuyāt ubhayam evāgneyaṃ syāt*. AB. 5, 29-31 seems to elaborate this point and strongly advocates the performance after sunrise. TB. 2, 1, 2, 12 (an interpolation?) rejects the own view of 2, 1, 2, 7 and especially AB.'s. The final conclusion (one should offer *auṣasam*) on the one hand forms a compromise and on the other hand fairly agrees with the view of the older Yajurvedins (KS. *upodayam*; MS. *vyuṣṭāyām*). Cf. VādhS. 2, 10 (*A.O.* 2, p. 149) dealing with the *anvādhāna* of the fires: *śvo bhūte* is rejected *(yathānāgatāyātithyaṃ kuryād)*; *udite* is likewise rejected *(yathātītāyātithyaṃ kuryād)*; conclusion: *viraśmav āditye*. The second (interpolated?) view of TB. seems to be later than AB. One may compare ŚāṅkhB. which first observes *sa ya udite juhoti pravasata evaitan mahate devāyātithyaṃ karoti. atha yo 'nudite juhoti saṃnihitāyaivaitan mahate devāyātithyaṃ karoti. tasmād anudite hotavyam* (2, 9; ed. Sarma 2, 8, 1-4). Thereupon it continues with an obviously later version of the discussion which is found in AB. (see Keith, *Rig-Veda Brahmanas*, p. 355 in a note on ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9) and in which the offering before sunrise is criticized. The ultimate conclusion *(saṃdhau juhuyāt)* agrees with the compromise of TB. and JB. The image of night and day as two oceans and as Śyāma and Śabala is found in JB. as well as in ŚāṅkhB. Presumably ŚāṅkhB., in which Kauṣītaki is quoted as an authority (prescribing *sāyam astam ite purā tamasas tasmin kāle juhuyāt*; cf. JB. 1, 6 *astam ite purā tamisrāyai*), is the source. ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 2 ff. favours the offering after sunset and before sunrise with the well-known arguments: *sa yat sāyam astam ite (prātar anudite) juhoti ya idaṃ tasminn iha sati juhavānīti* (*yaḥ .. juhavāni = qui sacrificem = ut ego sacrificem*; see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 26, p. 112 f.); *tasmād uditahominām vicchinnam agnihotraṃ manyāmaha iti ha smāhāsurir yathā śūnyam āvasatham āhared evaṃ tad* (2, 3, 1, 9). The fact that ŚB. does not mention the counter-arguments against offering before sunrise and consequently does not arrive at the compromise of TB., ŚāṅkhB. and JB. might suggest that it belongs to an earlier phase. The very elaborate argumentation in defence of the own point of view (offering before sunrise) may, however, imply a refutation of the counter-argument (AB.) and therefore make the compromise superfluous. Finally I would refer to the old VādhS. 3, 26 (*A.O.* 4, p. 26 f.) which observes that some offer the evening and morning agnihotra *ahna eva rūpe* (presumably they offer after sunrise and before sunset) and others *rātriyā eva rūpe* (after sunset and before sunrise), whereas the agnihotra should be *ahorātrayor .. rūpam* (the argument

of AB.). VādhS. 3, 27 (o.c., p. 27) calls the moments of offering *anvastamita āditye* and *purodetoḥ* Prajāpati's world named Vibhān. Cf. JB. 1, 6 on Prajāpati's *dyumnaḥ*. The sūtras seem to make the time of offering optional. KŚS. 4, 15, 13 (dealing with the *paśukāma*) probably is based on JB, 1, 5.

5. If one is desirous of possessing cattle one should offer the agnihotra in the evening after the arrival of all the cattle.[1] Now the agnihotra is *brahman*. With *brahman* he thereby encompasses the cattle. At daybreak (he should offer) before the cows are let loose.[1] Now the agnihotra is *brahman*. With *brahman* he thereby encompasses the cattle. He encompasses these cows on both sides with *brahman*. He obtains cattle. He becomes rich in cattle.

If one is desirous of heaven (one should take the following mantra into consideration:)[2] "Two impassable, wide, large oceans come and go in a revolving, alternating movement like two footprints on a path".[3] Night and day are the two impassable oceans.[4] Those who offer by night enter the night-ocean[5] and those who offer after sunrise the day-ocean.[5] There is[6] an opportunity to cross[7] these two as if there would be a ford[8] (?) or a connecting causeway[9] (viz. the moment) when the sun has set,[10] but before darkness (and the moment) when it lights up[10], but before sunrise.[11]

6. Night and day are also those two (dogs) Śyāma and Śabala.[12] Śabala is the day, Śyāma the night. Those who offer by night fall into the hands of the Night-Śyāma and those who offer after sunrise of the Day-Śabala. The opportunity to pass these two is the same (viz. the moment) when the sun has set, but before darkness (and the moment) when it lights up, but before sunrise.

Moreover the appearance of light[13] at these (moments)[14] is Savitṛ.[15] Savitṛ is Prajāpati[16] and Prajāpati all the gods.[17] Thus there is offered by him to[18] Prajāpati, to all the gods. That is why this agnihotra is sacred to Prajāpati.[19] When here at daybreak it becomes light, in this very appearance of light Prajāpati generated the creatures. Savitṛ is Prajāpati, Prajāpati is identical with all the gods. Thus there is offered by him to Prajāpati, to all the gods. That is why this agnihotra is sacred to all the gods.[20]

Moreover night and day meet here (at the moment of the evening-agnihotra) facing this point *(evaṃmukham)*.[21] The agnihotra is food. Thus he places nourishment before the mouth *(mukhataḥ)*[22] of night and day. In the same way they meet again at dawn. The agnihotra

is food. Having thus placed nourishment before the mouth of night and day he escapes from those two repeated dyings which are night and day.[23]

NOTES

[1] KŚS. 4, 15, 13 *antaḥ paśau paśukāmasya sāyaṃprātaḥ*. Cf. MS. 4, 2, 11: 34. 17 *prātar evāntargoṣṭhāsu goṣu hotavyam*.

[2] From here to the end of this chapter see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 1. The mantra is rather abruptly introduced. The text may be corrupt here.

[3] The verse occurs with some differences at TS. 3, 2, 2, 1 (Caland and the crit. ed. quote 3, 2, 8, 1): *dvau samudrau vitatāv ajuryau paryāvartete jaṭhareva pādāḥ/ tayoḥ paśyanto atiyanty anyam apaśyantaḥ setunātiyanty anyam*. Keith translates: "Two oceans are there extended, unperishing; they revolve in turns like the waves in the bosom of the sea; seeing they pass over one of them seeing not they pass over the other with a bridge". JB. has only the first half of this mantra. According to Keith the bridge with which one of the oceans is crossed is "sleep pictured perhaps as a ship". If sleep is meant here, it is either pictured as a bridge, or as a ship, and not as both at the same time. Caland observes in a note on his translation of ĀpŚS. 12, 18, 17, where the verse is used in the same ritual context, that "Der Damm ist das Agnihotra (?)". This does not seem to be correct since the *setu* is placed in the night-ocean and not between the two oceans. The verse also occurs BŚS. 14, 7: 163. 9 ff and 26, 7: 281. 8 ff. (where it is explained and Keith's view on the *setu* is confirmed). VādhS. 4, 102 *(A.O.* 6, p. 222 f.) comments upon the verse in an *anvākhyāna* on the *cayana*. It explains *paryāvartete* of the mantra by *paryāvarīvartete* (cf. JB. version *āvarīvartete*). Unfortunately it does not comment on *jaṭhare 'va pādāḥ*, which is presumably corrupt. According to VādhS. the bridge *(setu)* is *prāṇa*. The three sūtras adopt the TS. version of the mantra without any changes, whereas JB. differs on the following points: *acaryau* for *ajūryau*; *mahāntāv*; *āvarīvartete* for *paryāvartete*; *caryeva* (v.l. *patheva*) for *jaṭhareva*; *pādau* (v.l. *padau*) for *pādāḥ*. The reading *acaryau* is not suitable in the context of the complete TS. mantra, where the oceans can be passed even without seeing *(apaśyantaḥ)*. Therefore JB. apparently has changed the mantra and adapted it to its own purposes. The idea that night and day are one or two impassable oceans was current in connection with the agnihotra. See Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 113 giving a quotation from the Śailāli Brāhmaṇa by Āpastamba: *samudro vā eṣa yad ahorātras, tasyaite gādhe tīrthe yat sandhī, tasmāt sandhau hotavyam* (ĀpŚS. 6, 4, 7). Cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9 (ed. Sarma 2, 8, 17 ff.) *samudro ha vā eṣa sarvaṃharo yad ahorātre. tasya gādhe tīrthe yat saṃdhye. tad yathā gāḍhābhyāṃ tīrthābhyāṃ samudram atīyāt tādṛk tat, yat saṃdhau juhoti*. Evidently *mahāntāv* is superfluous (perhaps a gloss on *vitatau*) and spoils the metre (a triṣṭubh in which *dvau* has to be read twosyllabic and *vitatau* should precede *acaryau* as in the TS. version). TS. *paryāvartete* forms an excellent pāda-beginning, whereas JB. *āvarīvartete* looks like an explanation of *paryāvartete* (cf. VādhS. *paryāvarīvartete*). The dual *pādau* or *padau* refers to two walking feet or two footprints which alternatingly return like day and night. Comparing ṚV. 3, 55, 15 where night and day are likewise two footprints I propose to read *padau* and (with one ms.) *patheva* ("as on a path") instead of *caryeva*. So we may conclude that JB. has taken a half-verse from TS., (perhaps) made prose of it, changed the meaning on some points and produced a sentence which makes sense.

[4] The image of night and day as two oceans is already present in the TS. version of the mantra, where, however, the passing between the two is not mentioned at all. The two oceans may represent high and low tide which alternate like night and day. Presumably JB. has combined the concept of the two alternating oceans from TS. with the description of the one impassable ocean from ŚāṅkhB. and ŚailāliB. (see n. 3) which has two tīrthas.

[5] Instead of *ahar eva samudraḥ* the classical Sanskrit would use a karmadhāraya compound.

[6] Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 157 takes *asti* as a copula. Caland, *Auswahl*, § 1 and § 2 translates here and in the parallel sentence of 1, 6 (where *asti* should be supplied) "es gibt". See Oertel, o.c., p. 184 on JB. 1, 6. Minard, *Trois Énigmes*, II, § 456 reads *tayor etad evātyayanam* (which is also the reading of JB. 1, 6 in the crit. ed.) instead of *tayor vā etayor atyayanam*. He seems to have overlooked that *etad eva* at 1, 6 refers back ("the same") to 1, 5, where the text need not be wholly identical.

[7] Oertel's translation "the (place for) crossing" (o.c., p. 157) is quite possible, since *atyayanam* seems to be on a level with *saṃkramaṇam* (see n. 9).

[8] Veda Vyasa (*Specimen pages*, p. 8) reading *caiṣavaṃ* instead of *vaiṣavaṃ* observes that "Caland suggests *vaiṣamyaṃ* but the manuscript evidence does not support the assumption of any conjunct consonant in the third syllable. F has *caiṣavaṃ (ca + aiṣavaṃ)* which I have accepted. I think *aiṣavaṃ* (derivative from *iṣu*) is to be taken with *saṃkramaṇaṃ*. My view is supported by the occurrence of *vā* twice". Caland rightly remarks in the margin of the manuscript that *ca* is not possible in the context. On account of the well-known combination *yathā vai* one may perhaps assume here a corrupt reading *yathā vai *ṣavaṃ* or **ṣacaṃ*. On the other hand one may also derive *vaiṣava-* from *viṣu-* (adv. "in both directions, on both sides") like *vaiṣṇava-* from *viṣṇu* (a suggestion which I owe to Prof. Gonda) and regard *vaiṣava-* as something which connects both sides.

[9] Caland translates *setor vā saṃkramaṇam* by ". . oder das Betreten eines Dammes". This does not seem to be correct since *saṃkramaṇam* is on a level with *vaiṣavam*, which, whatever its exact meaning may be, at least does not express an action. Therefore *saṃkramaṇam* should be interpreted differently. Cf. ŚB. 13, 2, 10, 1 where *setu* and *saṃkramaṇam* are almost synonymous ("a passing across, a bridge" tr. Eggeling). The genitive *setor* is explicative: a connection consisting of a causeway, i.e. a connecting causeway.

[10] *astam ite* and *suvyuṣṭāyām* are hypostatized locatives (Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 157).

[11] JB. *suvyuṣṭāyāṃ purodayāt* agrees with MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 9 *vyuṣṭāyām*, but there is a long discussion in the intervening period (see the introduction to this section). In *vyuṣṭāyām* the subject to be supplied is night. See Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 183 where several passages in which *vyuṣṭāyām* occurs together with *anudite (āditye)* and *purā sūryasyodetoḥ* are quoted. Interesting in connection with the present passage is PB. 12, 6, 8 *etad vai na naktaṃ na divā yad vyuṣṭāyām anudita āditye*.

[12] Cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9 (ed. Sarma 2, 9, 7 ff.), presumably the source of JB. (see introd. of this section). On the two dogs see Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.* 15 (1893), p. 163 ff.

[13] With some hesitation I render *dyumnaḥ* by "appearance of light". The Petr. Dict. and Monier-Williams do not mention the masc. form, but it sometimes occurs (e.g. Simon's Index on KS. refers to 5, 2). An interesting parallel for the meaning required here is found JB. 3, 361 (*Auswahl*, § 212) in

the difficult and corrupt passage dealing with the cosmogony of the golden egg: *tac* (sc. the egg) *chataṃ devasaṃvatsarāñ chayitvā nirbhidyam abhavat sahasraṃ vā; dyumnā ha nāma tapyāsur; yāvān eṣa saṃvatsaras, tāvantaḥ saṃvatsarasya pratimā; dyumnair ha sma saṃvatsaraṃ vijānanty; atha ha tataḥ purāhorātre saṃśliṣṭe evāsatur avyākṛte; te u agnihotreṇaiva vyākṛte* (Caland's text and punctuation). The crit. ed. using some new mss. reads: *sahasraṃ vā dyumnān. dyumnā ha nāma tarhy apy āsuḥ* ... The new text, which does not seem to be an improvement in all respects, is translated as follows by K. Hoffmann, "Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa", *M.S.S.* 27, p. 65: "Es wurde reif zum Aufspringen, nachdem es hundert Götterjahre dagelegen hatte oder tausend Dyumnas — Die sogenannten Dyumnas gab es damals auch noch. Wie gross das Jahr ist, so gross waren die Abbilder des Jahres. Mit den Dyumnas pflegte man das Jahr zu unterscheiden. Vordem waren Tag und Nacht zusammenhängend, nicht gesondert. Erst durch das Agnihotra wurden sie gesondert". What we miss in the sentence *dyumnā ha nāma tarhy apy āsuḥ* is a negation. In this cosmogony the most important fact is that nothing at all existed in the beginning. There was no difference between day and night; consequently the concept of time or at least the division of time in years was absent. One can only reckon by years if one has three hundred and sixty-five days, i.e. if one has a differentiation of day and night (which only exists since the coming into existence of the agnihotra and presumably of the *dyumnas*). On this situation in the beginning see ṚV. 10, 129 and especially the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 1 ff., which states *ajāto ha tarhi saṃvatsara āsa* and *nāha tarhi kā cana pratiṣṭhāsa*. I propose to read ... *sahasraṃ vā. dyumnā nāha nāma tarhy apy āsuḥ*, a simple emendation in which *dyumnān* (missing in Caland's ms.) is deleted before *dyumnā(nāha)* and one omitted syllable *nā* (haplology!) is inserted. My interpretation of the passage is: "Having lain for hundred divine years it was ready to break. Or was it for thousand divine years? For there were no appearances of light (= no sunrises) at all in that time (and consequently chronology did not exist). As old as this year that we know (*eṣa saṃvatsaraḥ* as distinct from the divine years, which for that matter can only be counted if there is a criterion like sunrises for measuring time), so old are the reflections of this year (e.g. the nights and days; see KS. 7, 15: 79.5 f.; TB. 1, 1, 6, 7: twelve nights the reflection of the year; ṢaḍvB. 3, 12: nine days; ŚāṅkhB. 17, 5 (ed. Sarma 17, 4, 17): *etāvān vai saṃvatsaro yad ahorātre*). One distinguishes the years by the appearances of light (for without sunrises there are no days, the *pratimāḥ* of the year, and without these *pratimāḥ* there is no year). Before that time (in the timeless, eternal period before the breaking of the egg) night and day (who are differentiated by the *dyumnāḥ*, the sunrises) were contiguous and undifferentiated. They were differentiated by the agnihotra" (I will elsewhere discuss some *cruces* of this text, e.g. the lack of concord in *tāvantas*). The moments between night and day are called *prajāpater vibhān* ("differentiating light"?) *nāma lokaḥ* at VādhS. 3, 27 (*A.O.* 4, p. 27), which prescribing this moment for the agnihotra performance moreover states: *vyavahāraṃ hy enayor* (sc. night and day) *eṣā devatā udeti vyavahāraṃ anvastameti*.

[14] One of the mss. and Veda Vyasa read *haiṣa* instead of *haiṣu*. Does *eṣu* refer to the moments when the agnihotra is performed?

[15] That Savitṛ is the light before sunrise appears from JUB. 4, 5, 1 *vyuṣi savitā bhavasy udeṣyan viṣṇur* ..

[16] For this identification see ŚB. 12, 3, 5, 1; PB. 16, 5, 17; GB. 2, 5, 22. Cf. also TB. 1, 6, 4, 1 *prajāpatiḥ savitā bhūtvā prajā asṛjata*.

[17] Sometimes *viśve devāḥ* refers to all the gods, sometimes to a special category, the All-gods. See Renou, *E.V.P.* 4, p. 1 ff. on these gods. TB. 3, 3, 7, 3 equates Prajāpati with *sarvā devatāḥ*, whereas according to ŚB. 6, 3, 1, 17 the *viśve devāḥ* are his sons.

[18] Here *juhoti* with loc. means "to offer to" and not "to offer in(to)". Cf. the end of 1, 8. In the agnihotra speculations which form a starting-point for the prāṇāgnihotra *juhoti* with loc. (the fires = *prāṇāḥ*) means "to offer in", but at the same time it implies "to offer to". Monier-Williams does not mention this use of *juhoti* with loc.

[19] Cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *prajāpatyam agnihotram*. See VādhS. 3, 27 (*A.O.* 4, p. 27) on Prajāpati's connection with the right moment for the performance of the agnihotra.

[20] Cf. TB. 2, 1, 4, 6 *brahmavādino vadanti kiṃdevatyam agnihotram iti. vaiśvadevam iti brūyāt*. Presumably there is no reference to the All-gods, but to all the gods. Cf. AB. 5, 26, 5 ff. calling the agnihotra which is sixteenfoldly equated with gods *vaiśvadeva*.

[21] Veda Vyasa reads *eva mukham*, but *evaṃmukham* of the crit. ed. (a compound with adverbial meaning) is preferable since *saṃdhattaḥ* though active means "to meet". Cf. ŚB. 10, 5, 4, 2.

[22] Probably *mukhataḥ* here means "before the mouth" (*mukha* denoting "face, direction" as well as "mouth"). Cf., however, ŚāṅkhB. 2, 1 (2, 1, 7) *mukhata eva tad ahorātre prīṇāti*, where *mukhataḥ* means "at the beginning".

[23] Compare the end of 1, 13. On *ahorātre*, besides which *ahorātrau* is found in other texts as well as JB., see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 51, n. 5 (on JB. 2, 29) and Thieme, *Gaṅganātha Jhā Comm. Vol.* (Poona 1937), p. 416 ff.

7–8. Interpretation of the agnihotra. The sun, which at the end of the day sixfoldly spreads, is redintegrated and generated by the agnihotrin

Here starts a series of mystic interpretations of the agnihotra which are concluded by the stock phrase *ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti* (JB. 1, 8; 9; 10; 11; 14; 16 etc.). The main theme of this section, viz. the desintegration of the sun at sunset and its reintegration through the agnihotra, has a close parallel in VādhS. 3, 24 (*A.O.* 4, p. 24 f.). Compare also ṢaḍvB. 4, 6, 2 f. (during the waning part of the month the moon enters herbs, forest-trees, cattle, sun, brahman and brahmins and is reintegrated by the brahmins in the *sāṃnāyya*-libation). The version of JB. (translated in Caland's *Auswahl*, § 3) misses the entrance of the sun in the earth (remarkably the passage on the reintegration from the earth is corrupt in VādhS.) and combines the theme of the sun which is gathered again with the well-known generation of the sun which has passed the night as an embryo. In this respect it may be less original. It tries (without much success) to solve the problem of the twofold agnihotra (evening and morning) which does not suit the single reintegration. The evening agnihotra means the impregnation of the sun, the morning ceremony its delivery. The superfluous reintegration at daybreak in fact is not made more acceptable. On this twofold aspect of impregnation and delivery (which in this section also implies deliverance from sin) in the agnihotra see also KS. 6, 5: 54. 5 ff. *(agnir eva pravāpayitvā sūryaṃ rātryai garbhaṃ dadhāti .. prātaḥ prajanayaty etaṃ vai prajāyamānaṃ prajā anu prajāyante)*; MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 6 f. *(agneyī sāyamāhutis tayā retaḥ siñcati. tad retaḥ siktaṃ rātryai garbhaṃ dadhāti)*; ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 3 ff. *atha yad astam eti, tad agnāv eva yonau garbho bhutvā praviśati ..; atha yat prātar anudite juhoti, prajanayaty evainam etat ..; tad etasyaivānu prajātim imāḥ sarvāḥ prajā anu prajāyante ..*; cf. KS.).

7. Yonder sun goes asunder in six parts[1] when it sets. "It has gone asunder"[2] the ancients who were acquainted with traditional legends used to say of it, but now (one says:) "it has gone down". When it sets it enters the brahmin with faith, cattle with milk, the fire with glow, the plants with sap,[3] the waters with juice,[3] the trees with pith.[4]

When the brahmin[5] cleanses the vessels that are used in the agnihotra ritual and when he is occupied[6] with them he thereby collects in it (sc. the sun) the faith with which it has entered him. And when they milk the milk (used for the agnihotra) he thereby collects in it the milk with which it has entered the cows. And when he pokes up the charcoals he thereby collects in it the glow with which it has

entered the fire. And when he holds a burning grassblade over the milk he thereby collects in it the sap with which it has entered the plants. And when he pours water on (the boiled milk) he thereby collects in it the juice with which it has entered the waters. And when he lays a firewood on the fire he thereby collects in it the pith with which it has entered the trees.

8. Having thus collected it he offers it[7] in the evening. It passes that night in the condition of an embryo. Having again collected it in the same way he offers it at dawn. He causes it to be born. Right at its birth it drives away all evil for him. The gods were born from Prajāpati. This one (the sun) is also born from him who knows thus. He wins a "world"[8] that is as large as the one Prajāpati has won.

Moreover it thinks: "This one certainly collects me properly[9]. Well, let him reach old age sound in life and limb,[10] unbroken." And it also thinks: "This one certainly knows me properly. Well, let me enter him". It enters him who knows thus.

It is the sole hero[11] who shines here, it is Indra,[12] it is Prajāpati.[13] To him therefore is offered by the one who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

[1] VādhS. 3, 24 (*A.O.* 4, p. 24) makes the sun enter into seven beings or elements (the six of JB. and the earth).

[2] *vyamrucad*. Since only *nimrocati* is found elsewhere, *vimrocati* seems to have been created for this occasion. On the special initial and final position of *vyamrucad* and *nyamrucad* underlining the contrast see Gonda, *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda* (Amsterdam Academy 1959), p. 115 f.

3 Here *ūrj* is connected with plants and *rasa* with water, whereas JB. 3, 358 (explaining why the sun is called āditya: *tad yad eteṣāṃ bhūtānām ādatta tad ādityasyādityatvam*) observes that *sa* (sc. the sun) ... *ādatte* ... *ūrjam apāṃ rasam oṣadhīnām*.

[4] On *svadhā* representing "la caractéristique essentielle de l'espèce 'arbre'" see Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* I, p. 151 in a note on MNU. 208 (dealing with *svadhiti*).

[5] Here the version of VādhS. has *atha yad brāhmaṇo juhoti tad u haivainaṃ brahmaṇa 'dhi saṃbharati*. JB. starts with the brahmin, VādhS. concludes with his performance of the offering. The correspondence is more perfect in the rest of the passage.

[6] *pariceṣṭati*. Veda Vyasa follows Caland in accepting *pariceṣṭati*, but supposes that the correct reading may be *pariveṣṭi*. He refers to AB. 1, 17, 5; TB. 2, 1, 2, 12 and ŚB. 1, 3, 1, 2. The last mentioned place *(atha patrāṇi nirṇenijati tair nirṇijya parivevişati)*, though at first sight interesting, is not a real parallel, since it relates to the serving of food in a non-ritual sphere. Presumably *pariceṣṭati* should be retained. It may refer to the arranging of the sacrificial implements to the north of the gārhapatya. Cf. BŚS. 3, 4: 72. 16 f. *athaitāny agnihotrapatrāṇi prakṣalitāny uttareṇa gārhapatyam upasādayati*

kūrce vā sūnāyāṃ vā. It should be observed that the text is very systematical in keeping up the chronological order of the ritual in this passage. So *pariceṣṭati* must denote an action which takes place immediately after the cleansing of the vessels.

[7] Cf. KS. 6, 3: 51. 11 f. *payasāgnihotraṃ juhoty amum eva tad ādityaṃ juhoti*. See also the introduction to this section and *Agn. a Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V A and C on the cosmic symbolism of the agnihotra.

[8] On this conception of winning a "world" see Gonda, *Loka. World and Heaven in the Veda* (Amsterdam Academy 1966), passim and especially p. 37. By creating one god (the sun) one obtains the same space (sphere of influence?) as Prajāpati, the creator of all gods.

[9] With *anuṣṭhyā* (according to Monier-Williams only meaning "immediately") I hope to deal on another occasion. For my translation compare Eggeling's rendering "properly" (ŚB. 2, 4, 4, 21) and "in due form" (ŚB. 1, 5, 1, 10). The form occurs also in JB. 1, 53.

[10] At other places *sāṅga* and *satanu* mean "with a body and limbs" when referring to a bodily rebirth in heaven.

[11] Elsewhere instead of *eko vīraḥ* the compound *ekavīra-* is found. Mostly it is an epithet of Indra. Here it denotes the highest god, the Supreme, identical with the sun. According to JUB. 2, 2, 3, 1 the *ekavīra* is the *prāṇa*. Remarkably the *ekarṣi* is likewise identified with sun as well as with *prāṇa*. See Gonda, *Savayajñas* (Amsterdam Academy 1965), p. 404.

[12] For the equation of Indra and sun see JUB. 1, 9, 1, 2; 1, 10, 2, 5; ŚB. 1, 6, 4, 18; 2, 3, 4, 12; 3, 4, 2, 15; 4, 5, 5, 7; 4, 5, 9, 4; 4, 6, 7, 11; 8, 5, 3, 2.

[13] Cf. JB. 2, 370 (*Auswahl* § 160) *atho eṣa vai prajāpatir yo 'sau tapati*; ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 17 *atha yat paraṃ bhāḥ prajāpatir vā sa indro vā*. One offers to the supreme god who in his cosmic aspect manifests himself as the sun, but also enters man (presumably as his *prāṇa*, the *ekavīra* or *ekarṣi*). Man is identical with the Supreme. The agnihotra as a sacrifice to this highest principle may be compared to the prāṇāgnihotra.

9–10. *The agnihotra frees the performer from evil*

This section elaborates one sentence from JB. 1, 8: *so 'sya jāyamāna eva sarvaṃ pāpmānam apahanti*. Originally the deliverance from evil was only connected with the morning agnihotra, in which the sun frees itself from the evil of darkness. By the performance of the agnihotra man is also freed from his evil or sin. See ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 6 "Even as a snake frees itself from its skin, so does it (the sun-child) free itself from the night, from evil: and, verily, whosoever, knowing this, offers the Agnihotra, he frees himself of all evil, even as a snake frees itself from its skin" (tr. Eggeling). The quoted sentence from JB. 1, 8 likewise refers only to the morning agnihotra. This section, however, makes the deliverance apply to both agnihotras by introducing the offering of sun in fire and fire in sun. On this subject see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V A and C.

The sūtras describe the taking out of the fire *(uddharaṇa)* as a taking out of sin. The sacrificer recites: *bhūr bhuvaḥ suvar uddhara pāpmano mā yad avidvān yac ca vidvāṃś cakārāhnā* (resp. *rātryā) yad enaḥ kṛtam asti pāpaṃ sarvasmān moddhṛto muñca tasmād* (ĀpŚS. 6, 1, 7 and in most other sūtras). No brāhmaṇa mentions these formulas as Caland observes in a note on his translation of Āpastamba. Compare, however, AB. 5, 26, 1 f. *yad evāhnā* (resp. *rātryā) sādhu karoti tad eva tat prāṅ uddhṛtya tadabhaye nidhatte*. So both agnihotras are connected with the removal of sin or the safeguarding of good works.

This section was edited by Oertel, "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 88 f. The text of the crit. ed. is identical.

9. The evil that is committed in the day time, of that the sun is the cause. What is committed at night, of that the fire. The two of them said: "If we shall (ever) be thus, we shall not be able to support the creatures. Well, let us be food (and) let us offer ourselves[1] in each other". When the sun sets, it offers itself in the fire.[2] Whatever evil the sun commits in the day time, that the fire[3] drives away for it at night. When the sun rises, the fire rises after it.[4] It offers itself in the sun. Whatever evil the fire commits at night, that the sun[5] drives away for it by day. As a snake frees itself from its skin,[6] as one pulls a rush out of its sheath,[6] so he frees himself from all evil,[7] who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

10. On account of the evening-oblation the fire drives away for him at night the evil that he commits by day. On account of the morning-oblation the sun drives away for him by day the evil that he commits at night. As a snake frees itself from its skin, as one pulls a rush out of its sheath, so he frees himself from all evil. As in gold,

when it has been heated,[8] no stain, no evil,[9] at all remains, so there remains no stain, no evil, at all in him who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

[1] *itthaṃ ced vai bhaviṣyāvo na vai tarhi śakṣyāvaḥ prajā bhartum*. Exactly the same statement (made by *bṛhat* and *rathantara* after discord between *bṛhat*-animals and *rathantara*-animals had arisen) is found JB. 1, 294.

[2] See the introduction to this section. Eggeling correctly translates ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 36 "In the evening he offers Sūrya in Agni, and in the morning he offers Agni in Sūrya", but he takes *juhoti* with accusative as "to offer to" in ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 2 *ādityo vai gharmas taṃ sāyam agnau juhomy agnir vai gharmas taṃ prātar ādityе juhomi* (cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 1 *gharmo vā eṣa pravṛjyate yad agnihotram. tad asau vai gharmo yo 'sau tapati*; see also TB. 2, 1, 3, 2 and KS. 6, 3: 52.9): ".. to him I make offering in Agni in the evening ..". For a similar misinterpretation see H. Lefever, *The Vedic Idea of Sin* (Nagercoil 1935), p. 60 translating JB. 1, 23 *so 'ham adas satyam asmin satye sāyaṃ juhomīdaṃ satyam amuṣmin satye prātar juhomi* by "In the evenings I offer to *satya* (fire) in *satya* (sun) and in the mornings to *satya* (sun) in *satya* (fire)". That the sun enters the fire at night appears also from AB. 8, 28, 9; TB. 2, 1, 2, 9; KS. 7, 4: 66. 1 and MS. 1, 5, 5: 73. 11 ff.

[3] The fire is *pāpmano 'pahantā* (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 13) and *sarveṣāṃ pāpmanām apahantā* (ŚB. 7, 3, 2, 16).

[4] Cf. TB. 2, 1, 2, 10 *udyantaṃ vāvādityam agnir anusamārohati*. See also Caland's translation (with note 3) of ĀpŚS. 4, 1, 8.

[5] The sun is *pāpmano 'pahantā* according to ŚB. 13, 8, 1, 11. The evil that one commits by day or night is removed by the sun, if one worships the sun thrice a day (KauṣU. 2, 7).

[6] For these similes see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 122 (in a note on JB. 2, 134) and especially "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 89 (where the correct reference for the simile of the snake skin should be ŚB. 2, 5, 2, 47). See also Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 107 quoting a Jābāli Brāhmaṇa *(yathāhis tvaco nirmucyate, evaṃ sarvasmāt pāpmano nirmucyante)*. E. W. Hopkins, "Gods and Saints of the Great Brāhmaṇa", *Trans. Conn. Ac. A. Sc.* 15 (1909), p. 30 refers in his chapter "Morality" to PB. 4, 9, 5 and 9, 8, 8 ("cast off sin as Arbuda the snake casts his skin"). It is, however, doubtful if the dead skin represents sin there. See Sāyaṇa's commentary on 9, 8, 8 (.. *ata etābhis stuvānā api mṛtaṃ yajamānam apagamayanti*; he differently comments on 4, 9, 5). Casting off the skin seems to mean overcoming death in PB. See PB. 25, 15, 4: "Through this (rite) the serpents vanquished death. They who perform it vanquish death. Therefore they (the serpents), having left aside their old hide, creep further, for they had vanquished death" (tr. Caland). In fact both sin as well as death are a *pāpman*.

[7] On the Vedic conception of sin, evil etc. see S. Rohde, *Deliver Us from Evil. Studies on the Vedic Ideas of Salvation* (Lund 1946), who gives an extensive bibliography, but fails to mention H. Hartog, *Zur Frage des frühvedischen Sündenbegriffes. Eine sprach- und religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (thesis Marburg 1939). The latter work discusses the previous treatment of this subject (p. 6-10) and i.a. deals with *pāpman* and *pāpa* (p. 59-66). The difference between *pāpman* (the evil from which man wishes to be delivered here) and *pāpa* (in this passage frequently used for the evil which is

committed) is that *pāpman* "does not as *pāpa* signify an evil work although comprising also this kind of evil. It does not appear with *karoti*, and is not contrasted to *puṇya*" (Rohde, p. 34 f.).

[8] *dhmāte* from *dham-* "to blow". The blacksmith blows wind on the fire by means of bellows and thus heats the metal. I doubt if *dham-* means "to (s)melt". Does the purification of metals only imply melting? Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 214 translates: "Just as, when gold is smelted (= refined) .." (cf. Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 680: "fondu"). For the refining of gold he refers to PB. 17, 6, 4 *yathā hiraṇyaṃ niṣṭaped evam enam [yajamānam] agniṣṭun niṣṭapati* and JUB. 3, 6, 6, 6 *tad yathā ha vai suvarṇaṃ hiraṇyam agnau prāsyamānaṃ kalyāṇataraṃ kalyāṇataraṃ bhavati* ... Remarkably Oertel leaves out of account PB. 17, 6, 3 ... *upaivainaṃ tad dhamati*. Caland translates: ".. he (the performing priest) thereby blows on him", and observes in a note: "So that all alien substances are removed from him, just as the blacksmith blows on the metal to cleanse it". It is, however, not the blowing itself which purifies the metal, but the heating caused by the blowing. One should not separate PB. 17, 6, 3 from 17, 6, 4 by distinguishing with Sāyaṇa a *lohakāra* in 3 and a *svarṇakāra* in 4. The verb *niṣṭapati* in 4 may be only an explanation of *dhamati* in 3. Compare also JB. 2, 136 (*Auswahl*, § 140) *yathā ha vai niṣkaḥ śamalagṛhīta evaṃ sa yo 'nucānaḥ san na virocate, 'gnā u vā etaṃ prāsyanti yam agniṣṭutā yājayanti, tad yathā niṣkaṃ śamalagṛhītam agnau prāsya tasyāyoghanena sarvaṃ śamalaṃ nirhanyād evaṃ haivāsya sarvaṃ pāpmānaṃ nirghnanti*. This passage, a parallel of PB. 17, 6, 3-4, makes it clear that neither smelting of ore, nor refining of metal by melting is meant. The gold is heated and then beaten. Apparently *dham-* means "to blow; to blow as a blacksmith, i.e. to heat; to hammer the heated metal in order to refine or model it; to forge". This semantic development has already taken place in ṚV. See Renou, *E.V.P.* 15, p. 57, whose translation of ṚV. 10, 81, 3 "il fond ensemble (comme à la forge), de ses deux bras, à l'aide des ailes, le ciel et la terre en (les) créant", however, fails to convince me. In Vedic cosmogony the conception of a fusion of heaven and earth (Geldner uses the verb "zusammenschweissen", "to weld") is not current. ṚV. 10, 72, 2 (where Geldner likewise translates *sam-dham-* by "zusammenschweissen") even more clearly shows that "forging", i.e. "shaping a material by heating and hammering" rather than "melting" is denoted by *dham-*. The *sat* comes into existence out of the *asat*, not to be taken with Geldner as "aus dem Nichts". The *asat* is the amorphous mass, the undifferentiated "Urmaterie", out of which the Creator forges (shapes) this cosmos with heaven and earth, i.e. the *sat*.

[9] For *na kaś cana nyaṅgaḥ pāpmā pariśiṣyate* compare JUB. 1, 14, 4, 5 (= 3, 6, 9, 7) *sa vidyād .. neha kaś cana pāpmā nyaṅgaḥ pariśekṣyata iti. tasmin ha na kaś cana pāpmā nyaṅgaḥ pariśiṣyate*; 2, 4, 3, 1 f. *na haiva tatra kaś cana pāpmā nyaṅgaḥ pariśiṣyate. sa vidyān neha kaś cana pāpmā nyaṅgaḥ pariśekṣyate sarvam evaitā devatāḥ pāpmānaṃ nidhakṣyanti* (by heating the last evils are removed). Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 214 renders *nyaṅgaḥ pāpmā* by "a trace (of) badness" and "trace (of) evil" (cf. Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 680: "trace de souillure"). The insertion of "of" between two nouns in apposition should, however, be rejected, the more so as the order of the nouns is reversed in the quoted parallels from JUB. Frequently *pāpman-* occurs in apposition to nouns expressing something unfavourable (see also Minard, o.c., § 226b observing that "Pāpman- forme avec nirṛti- un groupe formulaire analogue à Mṛtyu Pāpman"). Sometimes *pāpman-* precedes, sometimes it follows. When an equation with *pāpman-* precedes the apposition-

al use, the position of *pāpman-* is strikingly the same in both cases. ŚB. 6, 3, 3, 7 *śramo vai pāpmā ... tasya śramaṃ pāpmānam apāghnanti* against ŚB. 11, 1, 5, 7 *pāpmā vai vṛtro .. pāpmānaṃ vṛtraṃ hanti*. That in these cases *pāpman-* is not an adjective appears from ŚB. 7, 2, 1, 4 *atho ya eva pāpmā yā nirṛtis tam etābhir apahate. tad yad etābhiḥ pāpmānaṃ nirṛtim apahate tasmād* ... Cf. JUB. 4, 8, 3, 10 *(apahatya mṛtyum apahatya pāpmānam)*, where the appositional combination *mṛtyuḥ pāpmā* is split up, as we have dissolved *nyaṅgaḥ pāpmā* in our translation "no stain, no evil". Sometimes, however, *pāpman-* preceding a noun must be an adjective. Keith translates AĀ. 2, 1, 4 *asya dviṣan pāpmā bhrātṛvyaḥ* by "his enemy, the evil one, who hates him", but the position of *pāpmā* makes it clear that it has to be taken like *dviṣan* as the attribute of *bhrātṛvyaḥ*. Cf. ŚB. 1, 2, 4, 3 *pāpmane dviṣate bhrātṛvyāya* .. "the wicked, spiteful enemy" (Rohde, *Deliver Us*, p. 49). Besides those cases in which the position of *pāpman-* is influenced by a preceding equation, the noun *pāpman-* also comes before its apposition in a "groupe formulaire" as was observed by Minard (o.c., § 226b).

Reverting to *nyaṅgaḥ pāpmā* we must conclude that "trace" cannot be the correct translation, of *nyaṅga-*, since "trace" itself does not denote something unfavourable. Now *nyaṅga-* derives from *ni-añj-* "to smear, anoint". So *nyaṅga-* denotes the substance sticking to an object as the result of smearing, often with the implication of dirt or badness. See TB. 3, 2, 10, 2 *sphyaṃ prakṣalayanti medhyatvāya, atho pāpmana eva bhrātṛvyasya nyaṅgaṃ chinatti* and especially TB. 3, 7, 6, 20 *triṣphalīkriyamāṇānāṃ yo nyaṅgo avaśiṣyate rakṣasāṃ bhāgadeyam*, where again *nyaṅga-* is regarded as a residue *(avaśiṣyate)*, i.e. in a way as a trace of something, but denotes itself the idea of badness, evil, dirt etc.

11. *The agnihotrin is taken to heaven by the rising sun and released from death*

An excellent parallel to this section is found in ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 9, where the agnihotrin places his hands on the sun (= Death) by the evening oblations and his feet on the sun by the morning oblations. The rising sun takes him up and thus he remains beyond the reach of death. In the same context other motifs occurring in this section are found: beyond the sun is immortality, on this side death (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 7); night and day are on this side of the sun (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 11). ŚB. does not explicitly mention an elephant in its image of the rising sun, but the same simile as in JB. seems to be meant. Now it is remarkable that ŚB. uses this simile *inter alia* in order to prove that its views on the right time for the performance of the agnihotra are correct. Is this elephant simile in ŚB. (the sun-elephant is still *anudita-* when the morning agnihotra is performed) inspired by AB. 5, 31, 2 which states that by offering after sunrise (i.e. to an elephant with its trunk stretched forth) one is taken to heaven on the elephant's trunk? There is no trace of this discussion in the JB. passage, which consequently may be later than ŚB.

For this section see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 4.

11. Nagarin Jānaśruteya used to say: "The sun here enters its lair[1] viz. the fire, when it sets". By offering the two evening-oblations he gets a foothold on the back of this sun. It is like getting a foothold with both feet.[2] When now he offers these two morning-oblations, it lifts him up by means of these two. As an elephant rises together with him who is sitting on the elephant-seat, so this deity rises together with him who offers knowing thus.[3] It makes him go to its own world of which there is none supreme.[4] Whatever is beyond the sun, that is immortality.[5] That he wins. And whatever is on this side of the sun, night and day[6] carry this away from here, as a whirlwind may carry away.[7] There are many worlds beyond the sun. All these are reached, are won by him, in all these he has free and unrestrained movement[8] who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

[1] In spite of parallels such as ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 3 *atha yad astam eti tad agnāv eva yonau garbho bhūtvā praviśati* (see also JB. 1, 8 and 9) I doubt if *yoni-* here means "womb" or "birthplace". The context refers to an animal (in JB. explicitly called elephant) which lies down and rises up again the next morning. So *yoni-* here has to be taken as "safe place", "lair".

[2] Instead of Caland's *ubhayapadī* Raghu Vira reads with all mss. *ubhayāpadī*. Cf. JB. 3, 90 *yathobhayāpadī pratitiṣṭhet tādṛk tat*; JUB. 4, 8, 4, 3 *sa yathobhayāpadī pratitiṣṭhaty evam eva svarge loke pratyatiṣṭhan* (Oertel in his notes on p. 243 remarks "*ubhayāpadī*: sc. *devatā*", an untenable interpretation of the case-ending of this word).

[3] VādhS. 4, 28 c (*A.O.* 6, p. 135) likewise compares the rising sun to a rising elephant which carries people on its back to heaven, but in a different context (the right time for undertaking the *dīkṣā*).

[4] Caland reads .. *ya etasyeyataḥ paraṃ nāsti*. In his translation ".. der sich jenseits dieses so grossen (Raumes) befindet" the negation is not rendered. Raghu Vira's correct reading *etasyai yataḥ* also occurs JB. 3, 377 *sa yad asmāl lokād evaṃvit praity eṣā* (referring to a *devatā* which is called *prāṇa*, but described as the sun) *haivainaṃ devatādāyotpatati. sainaṃ taṃ lokaṃ gamayati ya etasyai* (referring back to *devatā* as at JB. 1, 11) *yataḥ paraṃ nāsti*. Remarkably the last sentence is found without variations JB. 1, 11. Since at least in the context of JB. 1, 11 many worlds beyond the sun are mentioned, *yataḥ paraṃ nāsti* does not relate to distance, but to quality. Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 10 *etad agnihotraṃ yājñavalkya nātaḥ param astīti hovāca*.

[5] Cf. ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 7 (those who are on the other side of the sun, of death, are immortal, are gods); JB. 3, 359 *te ye 'rvāñco raśmaya ete hāvaśā mṛtyor annavantaḥ, atha ya ūrdhvās ta u hāmṛtalokāḥ*.

[6] Night and day represent time in its destructive aspect and are the opposite of eternity and immortality. They destroy the good deeds in yonder world. See TB. 3, 10, 11, 2 and ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 11 (which expressly states that their scope is on this side of the sun, so that the good deeds of the deceased who has reached the sun cannot be destroyed).

[7] On the difference between the roots *manth-* "to churn" and *math-* "to take away, to rob" see Johanna Narten, "Das Vedische Verbum *math*", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 121-135. With reference to the present passage she observes (o.c., p. 127): "JB. I 11 (Caland, Auswahl, § 4) wird als Gegensatz zu der Unsterblichkeit, die man jenseits der Sonne gewinnt, festgestellt: *atha yad arvācīnam ādityād, ahorātre tad upamathnīyātām ito yathā reṣmopamathnīyād evam* "was aber diesseits der Sonne ist, das dürften Tag und Nacht von hier rauben gerade so wie ein Sturmwind raubt" [with the following note on *upamathnīyātām*:] Wohl so zu lesen statt handschriftlichem *upamathnītām*, wofür Caland Part. *upamathatī* (das übrigens, sofern vom Präsensstamm, *upamathnatī* heissen müsste) konjiziert und mit *itaḥ* als 2. Du. von *i* "gehen" verbindet: "das wird beständig durch Tag und Nacht (d.h. durch die Zeit) zerstört". Bei einer solchen Auffassung von *itaḥ* wäre aber auch das zweite Verb in Part. + *i* aufzulösen, also (statt handschriftlichem *upamathnīyāt*) eine weitere Konjektur *upamathnan iyāt* zu machen. (Zu *upamathnītām*, wenn es nicht blosser Schreibfehler ist, vgl. Opt. *trāsīyāthām*, Oldenberg *ZDMG*, 63, p. 297)". The argument that Caland's conjecture would require a second one *(upamathnan iyāt)* is not convincing since the activity of the whirlwind is not continuous as in the case of night and day. The parallelism between *upameya* and *upamāna* is not complete here. The optative *upamathnīyāt* expresses "as it may happen that .." or "as if a whirlwind would ..". This brings me to another criticism. Why should the parallelism between main and subordinate clause in this simile be such that *upamathnītām* should represent an optative (like *upamathnīyāt*)? The translation "das dürften Tag und Nacht von hier rauben" expresses a contingency which hardly was the brāhmaṇa-author's intention. An optative is not suitable here. On the other hand Caland's conjecture (emended to *upamathnatī*) seems to be too

radical. In the context *upamathnītām* would form an excellent injunctive ("erwähnende Beschreibung"; "zeitlos"; see Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967) but for its late occurrence in a Vedic prose text (according to Hoffmann, o.c., p. 110 the "nicht-prohibitive Injunktiv" is not found in Vedic prose). *Non liquet.*

[8] Cf. JUB. 3, 5, 9, 3 *te sarva āptā bhavanti te jitās teṣv asya sarveṣu kāmacāro bhavati ya evaṃ veda.*

12–14. *Agni (= Death) is conquered by means of liquid oblations such as milk and especially soma*

A remote parallel of this extinction of Agni-Mṛtyu is found VādhS. 3, 32 (*A.O.* 4, p. 30) in the agnihotra section: *tad u vā eṣa eva mṛtyur yad agniḥ; sa yaj jvalati juhuyān, mṛtyor mukhe pūrvām āhutiṃ juhuyān mṛtyor mukha uttarāṃ; sa yatraiva bahurūpā ivāṅgārāḥ syus, tat samidham ādhāya kanīyo hutvā bhūyo juhuyān; mṛtyum eva pūrvayāhutyā śamayitvā suvargaṃ lokam uttarayādhikrāmati.* One offers on the charcoals and not in the flames in order to subdue Agni (= Death) present in the coals.

The *somāhuti* which is described as a more efficacious extinguisher of Agni-Death than the milk-oblation may be an incidental agnihotra performed with *soma* instead of milk. JB. 1, 14 seems to give the special formulas for that soma-agnihotra.

For JB. 1, 12-13 see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 5.

12. The gods were fighting with Death. Death on that occasion was Agni.[1] They said: "Come, let us try to subdue[2] him[3]". They said: "Let us offer a butter-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They offered a butter-oblation. This he made his food, towards this he blazed up. Therefore it (the sacrificial fire) blazes up towards it when they offer a butter-oblation.

They said: "Let us offer a victim as oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". Having killed a victim and cut the fat into small pieces they offered a victim-oblation. This he made his food, towards this he blazed up. Therefore it (the sacrificial fire) blazes up towards it, when they offer a victim as oblation.

They said: "Let us offer a milk-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They offered a milk-oblation. By that they subdued him. Therefore (extinguished) coals are the result, when they offer a milk-oblation. They said: "We have subdued[4] him by means of food.[5] Well, let us try to subdue him once and for all".

13. They said: "Let us offer a soma-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They performed a soma-sacrifice. They offered a soma-oblation. By that they subdued him completely. Therefore coals are the result, when they offer a soma-oblation.

He who knowing thus offers a butter-oblation or a victim as oblation thereby hits upon his (Mṛtyu-Agni's) favourite speciality.[6] But when he offers a milk-oblation, then he subdues him by that. And

when he offers a soma-oblation, it is as though after having subdued him once he would finally defeat him. He escapes from those two repeated dyings which are night and day.[7]

14. **somāhutighaṭṭaḥ* (?).[8] He lays on a firewood (reciting:) "For outbreathing thee".[9] He offers the oblation (reciting:) "I have placed immortality in the inbreathing, *svāhā*".[10] Then he touches the ladle[11] (reciting:)[12] "My heart[13] is the setting out, my mind the continuous progress, my sight the turning towards, my hearing the drawing near,[14] my speech the arrival. The oblation has fallen to the share[15] of the gods and been enjoyed. It has placed me[16] in immortality. Let my lifebreaths enter[17] me (again) that I may do more good deeds". He does more good deeds. And in yonder world the evil reputation of being a sinner[18] does not reach him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

[1] For the identification of fire and death see besides the parallel from VādhS. quoted in the introduction ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 7; ŚāṅkhB. 13, 3, 4; JUB. 1, 8, 1, 8; 2, 5, 1, 2; VādhS. 3, 19 (*A.O.* 4, p. 19 f.).

[2] *jigīṣāma* is the subjunctive of a desiderative with conative force. Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 293, n. 1 needlesly doubts the correctness of this reading in JB. 3, 370.

[3] Read with Caland (who gives no v. l.) *etemaṃ*. The crit. ed. has *ete 'muṃ*.

[4] The corrupt *ajeṣu* should be emended to *ajeṣma* (instead of *ajaiṣma* proposed by Caland).

[5] Caland reads *anena* instead of *annena*.

[6] This does not imply that the offerer of a butter- or victim-oblation falls into the hands of Death. These oblations are only inferior since Death is not subdued, but temporarily appeased. Going to a god's *priyaṃ dhāma* means averting his anger if he is a terrifying deity as appears from ŚB. 9, 1, 1, 22 .. *tasmād yatraitasmād devāc* (sc. Rudra) *chaṅketa tad etābhir vyāhṛtibhir juhuyāt. upa haivaitasya devasya priyaṃ dhāma gacchati. tatho hainam eṣa devo na hinasti*. Going to Indra's *priyaṃ dhāma* (ŚāṅkhB. 22, 4) implies "that one comes into contact with Indra's divine sphere" (Gonda, *The Meaning of the Sanskrit Term* dhāman-, Amsterdam Acad. 1967, p. 62). This access to a god's favourite *dhāma* is mostly gained by offering oblations which are somehow especially connected with, sacred to or dear to that god. Now clarified butter is the *priyaṃ dhāma* of Agni (Gonda, o.c., p. 25) and of the gods in general (o.c., p. 26: "one supplies them with their *priyaṃ dhāman-* when one makes an offering with clarified butter"). In the present passage Agni's *priyaṃ dhāma* is reached by offering his *priyaṃ dhāma*, i.e. butter or a victim. What is that *dhāma* to which one comes? Sometimes *dhāman-* denotes something very concrete such as "abode" and coming to a god's beloved *dhāma* means "gaining access to the god's presence" (Gonda, p. 64). See also KauṣU. 3, 1, where Prātardana after reaching Indra's *priyaṃ dhāma* is addressed by that god. Now *dhāman-* does not simply mean "abode". It has as its original, central meaning "location, manifestation, projection etc. of a god's divine

power", as is demonstrated by Gonda, who refers (o.c., p. 62) to this general meaning in connection with JB. 1, 13. I am under the impression that *priyam evāsya tena dhāmopagacchati* here does not refer to actually reaching the god in one of his favourite abodes, but that it denotes something like "to hit upon the god's speciality, special sphere, special interest, special sphere of interest (by offering his favourite oblation); to catch his fancy; to come in his good books". Compare the passage from ŚB. 9, 1, 1, 22 quoted above.

[7] The same sentence occurs at the end of 1, 6, where in the context of the discussion on the right time for the performance of the agnihotra night and day represent death rather than recurring death. On the other hand the statement that night and day are recurring death has no foundation in the direct context of 1, 13 (only 1, 11 mentions night and day). Is the end of 1, 13 (originally dealing with the deliverance from death or rather with its subjection) influenced by the end of 1, 6, where night and day indeed occur and *atimuc-* is more suitable in the context?

[8] This word, which is probably corrupt, does not occur elsewhere. Perhaps an agnihotra with a soma-oblation is announced at the beginning of this chapter which contains formulas without parallels in the ordinary agnihotra ritual.

[9] No sūtra prescribes this formula (which frequently is used in other contexts) for this action. On *prāṇa-* meaning "outbreathing" see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 55, p. 518 and P.-E. Dumont's defense of this interpretation *J.A.O.S.* 78, p. 51 ff. (against Edgerton).

[10] No parallel. Does *amṛtam* refer to the soma which is offered instead of the usual milk-oblation? That the fire represents the sacrificer's *prāṇa* or *apāna* appears also from the formula recited when a piece of wood is put on the fire: *iṣṭakām upadadhe 'mṛtam apāne* (evening agnihotra: *prāṇe*) *dadhāmi* (BŚS. 3, 6: 74. 13-18; VādhS. has *prāṇe* for both agnihotras according to Caland's ms.-transcript, p. 12 f. in the University Library of Utrecht). See also *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III.

[11] No sūtra states that the ladle should be touched after the *āhuti*. One touches the agnihotrahavanī after the milk has been ladled out and recites the *daśahotṛ*, a formula which only consists of equations between vital powers etc. and other entities and in this respect may be compared to *hṛdayaṃ pretir manas saṃtatiḥ* .. in the present text.

[12] The following formulas do not occur elsewhere. For the first compare VS. 20, 13 *lomāni prayatir mama tvaṅ ma ānatir āgatiḥ māṃsaṃ ma upanatir vasv asthi majjā ma ātir*. Eggeling translates this formula which is used at the *sautrāmaṇī*: "My hair is endeavour, my skin submission and approach, my flesh inclination, my bone wealth, and my marrow submission" (ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31). He observes in a note that the repetition of *ānati-* is strange and that a strong alliterative cadence is noticeable. Even more noticeable, however, is the occurrence of four words ending in *-ti*, among which *vasu* seems to be out of place. Probably the formula is corrupt. The repeated *ānati-* should be replaced by another word in *-ti* and *vasu* be removed. Remarkably the identification *vasv asthi* reverses the order; in the other four homologies the parts of the body precede. VS. has *prayati-*, *ānati-*, (and *āgati-*, which should shift to the last position and replace the repeated *ānati-*), *upanati-*, [*vasu-*, *ānati-*] *āgati-* corresponding to the nomina actionis of the JB. formula *(preti-*, *saṃtati-*, *ānati-*, *upanati-*, *āgati-)*. Obviously *saṃtati-* instead of *vasu-* belongs to this classification. JB. equates this fivefold series with the five vital powers, VS. with the five essential ingredients of the body. So apparently this identification is not based on one by one agreements of the

single elements of both series (i.e. *lomāni* and *prayati-* or *hṛdayam* and *preti-* or *lomāni* and *hṛdayam* do not obviously correspond as prāṇa and vāyu in micro-macrocosmic homologies), but consists of the equation of two series as a totality characterized by the same number. This implies that the nomina actionis *preti-* etc. must form an established unity of five items and that somehow a system more significant than "a strong alliterative cadence" should be discovered in them. In the version used in the *sautrāmaṇī* ritual *prayati-* ("endeavour" Eggeling; "Gabe" Caland's transl. of ĀpŚS. 19, 10, 2) occurs instead of *preti*; the other terms (i.a. deriving from *nam-*) seem to lie in the sphere of submission. According to Mahīdhara on ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31 they show the state of feeling of beings towards the royal sacrificer in the sautrāmaṇī. See also Sāyaṇa on TB. 2, 6, 5, 8. This interpretation may be correct in the context of the *sautrāmaṇī*, in JB. it does not make sense. Here we seem to have a development from *preti-* "departure" (on JB. *preti-* for ŚB. *prayati-* compare JB. 1, 56, where *preta-* has *prayata-* in the ŚB. parallel) to *āgati-* "arrival". The five terms ending in *-ti* may represent the successive stages of the course to heaven of the oblation (which is identical with the sacrificer's vital powers). The next verse states that the oblation has reached the gods, that it has placed the sacrificer (or rather his *prāṇāḥ*) in immortality and that the *prāṇāḥ* must re-enter the body. The VS. verse may have expressed the same idea, but have been reinterpreted in the sautrāmaṇī context. One may, however, notice that ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31 immediately after this formula refers to a "going to heaven". On the other hand the series from *lomāni* to *majjā* represents a succession from the most outward to the most inward element. On the terms *ānati* and *upanati* denoting a movement see n. 14. Now one may ask why a journey is described with five terms and why these very terms *saṃtati*, *ānati* and *upanati* are used. The explanation at least in the context of JB. is rather simple. One touches the ladle and starts with the top of the handle *(preti)*. Then one continues *(saṃtati)* in one straight line along the handle which connects the two extremities of the ladle. Towards the end of the journey one reaches the beak of the ladle and consequently has to deviate from the straight course. While "rounding" the beak one makes two curves *(natis)*: downwards and upwards or towards oneself and from oneself (*ā-* and *upa-*). Ultimately one reaches the extremity of the ladle *(āgati)*.

[13] Remarkably *hṛdayam* takes the place of *prāṇa* in this formula, whereas the next verse speaks of *prāṇāḥ (ā māṃ prāṇā viśantu)*, probably the vital powers *manas*, *cakṣus* etc.

[14] The compounds of *nam-* do not always mean "to bend, bow". Often they denote a turning towards, a directing oneself to, an aiming at, a drawing near. So here *ānati-* and *upanati-* may refer to the turning towards a goal (cf. in English: to bend one's steps towards) and the drawing near, if they do not simply express the curving movement of the finger striking along the beak of the ladle (see n. 12).

[15] I take *pratītam* as well as *juṣṭam* together with *asthāt* in a periphrastic construction which expresses the perfective aspect of the arrival of the oblation.

[16] I.e. the vital powers.

[17] The *prāṇāḥ* (in this case perhaps the vital powers and not the breaths) have to return to the body of the sacrificer. As often the sacrifice produces a temporary reaching of immortality in heaven, after which one has to return in order to live on. According to ŚŚS. 2, 9, 7 the sacrificer exhales after the first oblation with the formula *agan prāṇaḥ svargaṃ lokam* .. and inhales

after the second with *āgann apāna ātmānam* .. The only parallel for this action in the sūtras is found in VādhS. (Caland's ms.-transcript, p. 12): .. *hutvānuprāṇity amṛtaṃ prāṇaṃ mayi dadhāmy ā mā prāṇo viśatu sahāmṛtena śāntyā apradāhāyeti; .. anvapānity amṛtam apānam* .. etc. Here the exhalation as well as inhalation (again) place a breath in the sacrificer. Compare the *prāṇāgnihotra* formula (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 3) *prāṇe niviṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi śivo māviśāpradāhāya prāṇāya svāhā*, in which *śivo* cannot refer to the food offered and the *prāṇāḥ* seem to be described as entering the performer.

[18] The word *pāpivāc-* does not occur elsewhere. Here *vāc* means "talk, rumour, report". Compare TS. 2, 1, 10, 2 *apūtā vā etaṃ vāg ṛcchati yam ajaghnivāṃsam abhiśaṃsanti* and PB. 2, 17, 4 *śamalaṃ vā etam ṛcchati yam aślīlā vāg* ("ugly report" tr. Caland) *ṛcchati*. A bad reputation on earth, even if it is only based on slander, reaches the gods who are influenced by it in their judgments. See E. W. Hopkins, *Trans. Conn. Ac. A. Sc.* 15 (1909), p. 34.

15–16. *The discrimination of the good and bad deeds and the deliverance from the results of the bad deeds by means of the two agnihotra oblations*

This section seems to link up with the preceding, in which *sukṛtaṃ karoti* and *amuṣmin loke na pāpivāg āgacchati* may form the starting-point for the following discussion on the deliverance from sin at or before death. For a different treatment of this subject see JB. 1, 9-10.

15. As to this they say: "The good and the evil which a man does during his life, what is the discrimination[1] of these evil and good deeds?" The good which a man does during his life passes into his breaths, the wrong into his body. When the one who knows thus departs from this world, his good deeds rise up together with his breath and his wrong deeds are left with his body. As to this they say: "It is difficult to be sure[2] (that this will happen), when being about to die (?)[3] he will still have remained[4] with his wrong deeds. If (however) he gets rid of them already during his lifetime, it is perfectly known". Then indeed it (sc. the effect of his evil deeds) passes into the agnihotra.

16. The breaths correspond to mind; the body[5] to speech. When he offers the first oblation with speech (i.e. reciting the formula) and the second (reciting the formula) in thought *(manasā)*, then he separates[6] the evil and the good deeds. Therefore they say: "These two oblations must not be confused. For he separates the evil and the good deeds by means of them".

When he offers the first of the two evening-oblations with speech, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits by day. And when he offers the second (reciting the formula) in thought, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits overnight. And when he offers the first of the two morning-oblations with speech, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits overnight. When he offers the second (reciting the formula) in thought, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits by day. He keeps ridding himself of (the effects of) his evil deeds day by day who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

[1] Although the verb *vyāvartate* means "to be rid of" in this section, *vyāvṛtti-* here is not "deliverance" or "liberation" but "discrimination". All good and evil has to be separated. Cf. JB. 2, 35; 183; 188; 3, 306; ŚB. 12, 7, 3, 15; TB. 1, 8, 6, 5; 2, 1, 8, 2 *(pāpavasyasasya vyāvṛttyai)*; TB. 1, 3, 3, 5 *(pāpavasyasasya vidhṛtyai)*; PB. 6, 1, 12; 8, 9, 7; 13, 4, 8 *(pāpavasīyaso vidhṛtyai)*; ṢaḍvB. 1, 4, 6 *(pāpavasīyasaṃ vyākariṣyāmi)*. Perhaps a socio-religious discrimination underlies this view that good and evil should not be mixed. ŚB. 4, 1, 4, 5 states that, if a brahmin becomes the purohita of any one kṣatriya he may meet with or if a kṣatriya takes any brahmin as his purohita, good and wrong deeds would be mixed *(saṃ hy etaṃ sṛjete sukṛtaṃ ca duṣkṛtaṃ ca)*. For the same combination of discrimination between good and evil with liberation from evil as is found in this section see PB. 2, 1, 4 *pāpavasīyaso vidhṛtir. vi pāpmanā vartate ya etayā stute.* Cf. JB. 1, 133 (*Auswahl*, § 29) *bṛhadrathantare vyavartayet .. vi pāpmanā vartate.*

[2] No moral objections are put forward against the theory that sin is left on earth with the body, but the uncertainty inherent in this theory *(durviditaṃ vai tad)* induces the author to prefer the safer separation of good and wrong deeds before death by means of the agnihotra.

[3] *martyavān.* There are no parallels and the text may be corrupt. It is the opposite of *jīvann eva* in the next sentence.

[4] The subjunctive after *yadā* has the value of a fut. perf. according to Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 325.

[5] Here *ātman-* means "body". It is identical with *śarīram* in the preceding chapter.

[6] For a different separation brought about by the two oblations see ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 17 *manaś ca ha vai vāk caite āhutī. tan manaś caivaitad vācaṃ ca vyāvartayati. tasmād idaṃ manaś ca vāk ca samānam eva san nāneva.*

17–18. *Man has a human and a divine* yoni *and* ātman. *By sacrificing in the āhavanīya one produces a second* ātman *in heaven, in the sun, with which one is united after death, if one has the required knowledge of the self*

This section, which in the present form represents a unity, was edited and translated by Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 115 ff. and E. Windisch, *Berichte K.S.G.d.W.* 59 (1907), p. 111 ff. For a translation see also J. Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden* (München 1922²), p. 150 ff. and A. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1969), p. 125 ff. Two different passages seem to have been combined here. The first deals with man's two yonis. The father is reborn in his son, but he also produces a second self in heaven by offering the agnihotra in the āhavanīya (here we touch the central theme of JB. 1, 1-65 in this section which for the rest hardly refers to the agnihotra). After death one rises to heaven in order to be united with this second self. Here the text inserts a description of the path to the sun (with a conversation between the deceased and the doorkeepers of the sun) which also occurs (in a different form) in 1, 46 and 1, 49-50. The first and original passage continues with the arrival in heaven. Remarkably the conversation between the deceased and the sun, in which the sun gives back the ātman produced by the agnihotrin if the wrong answer is given to the question "Who art thou?", is also found at JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1 ff. The original passage seems to be continued at the very point where the JUB. parallel starts. It remains doubtful whether this continuation forms an original, complete unity with 1, 17. The effect of producing a self in heaven by performing the agnihotra seems to be overshadowed by the requirement that one correctly answers the question "Who art thou?". The connection with 1, 17 is, however, not excluded, whereas the passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād* obviously forms an insertion. JB. 1, 18 seems to contain a double test of the deceased. Twice he has to show that he knows that he is not an individual, but identical with the highest god. In the conversation with the doorkeepers there is no connection at all with the preceding agnihotra passage of 1, 17. The insertion rather abruptly starts with *tasya haitasya rtavo dvārapāḥ*, in which the genitive hardly refers back to the deceased, but presumably denotes the sun. See n. 15.

Since the passage in which the deceased answers the question "Who art thou?" or announces himself with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* .. occurs also KauṣU. 1, 2 there exist many interpretations. Besides the above mentioned literature (which deals with the JB. versions) one may also consult Böhtlingk, *Berichte K.S.G.d.W.* 42 (1890), p. 198 ff. [the first critical treatment of this passage]; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's* (Leipzig 1897), p. 25 ff. [who rightly did not assume imperatives in the verse]; Windisch, "Buddha's Geburt", *Abh. K.S.G.d.W.* 26, 2 (Leipzig 1908), p. 68 ff. [see his other publication mentioned above]; Keith, *The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* (London 1908), p. 17 ff. [like Deussen not assuming imperatives]; S. K. Belvalkar, *Third Oriental Conference* (Madras 1925),

p. 41 ff. [following Windisch and Hertel]; Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928²), p. 142 [following Deussen and Keith]; Renou, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* (Paris 1948), p. 16 ff. [following Windisch] and S. Bhattacharya, *A.I.O.C.* 16 (Lucknow 1955), p. 1 ff. [taking *mā* as the prohibitive particle with the injunctive]. In my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo ..*", *Z.D.M.G. Supplementa* I (1969), p. 843 ff. I have tried to show that those who follow Böhtlingk in taking *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta* (or its v.l.) as imperatives are wrong and that Windisch' solution of the problem that the imperatives *erayadhvam* (send me in a man) and *ānayadhvam* (take me to immortality) are contradictory, is untenable. The verse does not consist of two alternative answers or announcements. By reciting the whole verse the deceased demonstrates his knowledge of his heavenly origin and gives the password. The form *erayadhvam* is not a simple imperfect with omitted augment as Deussen, Geldner, Keith and Frenz seem to take it, but an injunctive. The deceased does not tell the doorkeepers something new. He just states an eternal, "zeitlos" truth. Here the function of the injunctive as an "erwähnende Beschreibung" (Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967, p. 163) is very suitable in the context.

The continuation of the original passage (after the insertion from *tasya haitasya rtavo dvārapāḥ* to *taṃ hātyarjayante)* with the discussion between the sun and the deceased apparently was misunderstood by Windisch and Hertel. First the wrong answer (the mentioning of one's name) to the question "Who art thou?" is described; then the correct answer follows. In view of the fact that the two scholars mentioned are wrong in their interpretation of the verse as well as of the rest of the passage, their remarks on the original stage of the three versions (Windisch, o.c., p. 120; *Buddha's Geburt*, p. 72; Hertel, o.c., p. 149 ff.) are not relevant. On the other versions see JB. 1, 46 and 1, 49 f. The passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād* has a more original form in this section in that the vocative *ṛtavaḥ* agrees with the ṛtus which are addressed with the verse. Moreover the end of the verse at JB. 1, 50 looks less original and more resembles the late version of KauṣU.

17. Two wombs, indeed, there are. The divine womb is the one, the human womb the other.[1] There are, indeed, also two worlds. The divine world is the one, the human world the other.

The human womb is (related to) the human world.[2] It is the generative organ of the woman. Out of that progeny is born. Therefore also one should desire a good wife (thinking:) "Let my Self come into existence in something good."[3] Therefore also one should seek to watch over[4] one's wife (thinking:) "Lest in my womb, in my world somebody else come into existence". When he is about to come into existence (during the coitus) the lifebreaths enter first, then the seed is emitted. He (sc. the prāṇa) turns the lifebreaths to

the (corresponding) orifices.[5] Therefore also one is born with those very characteristics which he (the father) possesses, although in semen (itself) there is no differentiation.[6]

And the āhavanīya is the divine womb, (which means) the divine world.[7] That one, forsooth, is the divine womb, the divine world. Therefore if anyone would offer in the gārhapatya, one might think of him: "He does what should not be done".[8] If he who correctly acts[9] (by offering in the āhavanīya) offers, then he thereby emits his Self in this divine womb. That Self of his comes into existence in yonder sun. He who knows thus has two Selves and two wombs. One Self and one womb has he who does not know this. When knowing thus one departs from this[10] world —

18. [11] — the lifebreath ascends first. It announces to the gods the quantity:[12] "So much good, so much evil has been done by him".[13] Thereupon he (i.e. the body)[14] rises up along with the smoke (of the funeral pyre).

Of that one (who gives out heat)[15] the seasons[16] are doorkeepers. To them he should announce himself[17] with this (verse):[18]

"O, Seasons, from the radiant[19] one, which is pressed out[20] every half month,[21] from the one who is connected with the pitṛs[22] the seed is produced. As such you sent[23] me in a man as your agent. From that man, your agent, you emitted[23] me in a mother. Thus I am produced,[24] being added[24] to itself by the twelvefold[25] (year) as the additional, thirteenth month. This I know, of this I am sure.[26] So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality".[27]

Him the seasons lead. As one who knows (leads) one who also knows,[28] as one who understands one who understands also,[28] so the seasons lead him. They convey him across. He comes to the one who gives out heat.

[29]At his arrival he (the sun) asks him: "Who art thou?" To him who announces himself by his (personal) name or by his family (name), he says: "That Self of yours that has been in me, that is yours (again)".[30] After that Self has been received back the seasons from all sides run towards him, grasp him by his feet and drag him away.[31] Night and day take possession of his world.

He should announce himself to him (the sun) with these words: "Ka (who) am I, thou art heaven.[32] As such I have gone to thee, the heavenly heaven".[33] Prajāpati indeed is Ka and he who knows thus is *suvargas* (heaven; sun). For he goes to heaven *(suvar gacchati)*. To him he (the sun) says: "Who thou art, that one am I. Who I am,

that one thou art. Come."[34] He approaches that essence of good deeds.[35]

His sons enter upon his inheritance, the Fathers upon (the effects of) his good conduct.[36] He who knows thus has two selves and two inheritances. If without knowing this one offers the agnihotra one has only one self and one inheritance.

NOTES

[1] Cf. ŚB. 7, 4, 2, 40 *dve vai yonī iti brūyād devayonir anyo manuṣyayonir anyaḥ. prācīnaprajananā vai devāḥ pratīcīnaprajananā manuṣyās. tad yad etāḥ prācīr upadadhāti devayoner evaitad yajamānaṃ prajanayati.* See also JB. 1, 259 *dvir ha vai yajamāno jāyate. mithunād anyaj jāyate yajñād anyat. tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate, atha yad yajñāj jāyate tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate.*

[2] Oertel, o.c., p. 116 translates "What this human womb is, that is the human world", and *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132 "The human world is (identical with) the human womb". The first translation is correct in taking *sā yā manuṣyayonir* as the subject, the second in avoiding the assumption of an elliptic relative clause. On the latter point (the interpretation of the pronoun *ya-*) see Gonda, *Lingua* 4 (1954), p. 1 ff.

[3] The reading *kalyāṇe* should with Hertel, o.c., p. 150 and Veda Vyasa be retained (see also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132), because *kalyāṇo* (Oertel's emendation) would imply that the quality of the future self should depend on the mother, a non-Vedic idea. The self of the father is continued in the son. Cf. AB. 7, 13; AU. 2; Manu 9, 8 and Windisch, *Buddha's Geburt*, p. 62.

[4] *jugupset.* The active of this desiderative (in the middle voice meaning "to avoid") is exceptional (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132). See, however, also TĀ. 10, 9, 1 and VādhS. 3, 101 (*A.O.* 4, p. 204). On guarding one's wife see BDhŚ. 2, 2, 3, 34 (.. *tasmāt svabhāryāṃ rakṣantu bibhyataḥ pararetasaḥ mā vaḥ kṣetre parabījāni vāpsuḥ*). See also Manu 9, 7-9.

[5] *sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi ni(r)vartate.* Oertel, o.c., p. 116 translates: "He returns these breaths (to the?) spaces", whereas Windisch, o.c., p. 115 f. conjectures *prakāśayann* and renders: "Er kehrt wieder, (indem er) diese Hauche (zum Vorschein bringt)". Hertel, o.c., p. 151 follows Windisch, but Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 rightly condemning this emendation developed a new interpretation: "He (viz. he who is about to come into existence) turns toward these breaths (which, in the macrocosm, are identical with) the ethereal spaces". His argument that the identification of the microcosmic *prāṇāḥ* with the macrocosmic *ākāśāḥ* corresponds to the identification of the microcosmic *manuṣyayoni-* with the macrocosmic *manuṣyaloka-* does not convince, since *manuṣyaloka-* hardly refers to a macrocosm in which ethereal spaces are found. The parallels adduced to show the connection of the *prāṇāḥ* with the *ākāśāḥ* are not conclusive. At ChU. 4, 10, 5; ŚB. 10, 6, 3, 2; 14, 7, 2, 6 (= BĀU. 4, 4, 6 Mādhy. = 5 K.) and KauṣU. 2, 14 one misses a plural *ākāśāḥ*. The only correct parallel is JB. 2, 18 *reto vā etad agre praviśati yad gāyatraṃ. tato 'nyāny aṅgāni vikriyante. prāṇo vā eṣa praviśati yad gāyatram tam anyāny aṅgāny upasīdanti. sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi nirmanthati* "The seed, viz. the Gāyatrī metre, enters first, from it the other members (of the body) are respectively fashioned; this breath indeed, viz. the Gāyatrī

metre, enters, the other members (of the body) cluster round it; this (primary) breath churns out (= generates) these (other) breaths (= sense organs) with reference to (?) the ethereal spaces" (tr. Oertel). A. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (thesis Marburg 1966), p. 61, n. 3 rightly interprets *ākāśāḥ* as the openings which are the seats of the senses: "Er quirlt diese prāṇas [d.h. die Sinne] zu den Öffnungen hinaus". He proposes to read *abhinirvartate* in JB. 1, 17 and translates: "Er kommt heraus zu diesen prāṇas nach den Öffnungen hin". See also his rendering *I.I.J.* 11, p. 126: "Der [nicht-irdische Ātman] kommt heraus zu diesen Prāṇas nach den Öffnungen hin". On *ākāśāḥ* meaning "openings" see JUB. 2, 4, 2, 10. ... *taṃ vai praviśateti. sa vā ākāśān kuruṣveti. sa imān prāṇān ākāśān akuruta. taṃ vāg eva bhūtvā "gniḥ prāviśan mano bhūtvā candramāḥ .."* "Verily enter that". "Then make spaces". He made these breaths spaces (for them). Fire, having become speech, entered that; (so did) the moon, having become mind .." (tr. Oertel). Here the *prāṇāḥ* are not lifebreaths or vital powers, but the organs of sense, or rather the orifices through which the gods (= vital powers, sense-functions) enter. See also A. K. Coomaraswamy, *J.A.O.S.* 66, p. 149, n. 13. The *ākāśāḥ* are in fact every kind of opening, e.g. the holes in a *vīṇā* (JB. 2, 70; *Auswahl*, 128) or the vulva (JB. 3, 360: *tad adhastāt prāṇam akuruta yathaiṣa striyā adhastād ākāśa evam;* see Hoffmann, *M.S.S.* 27, p. 65: "Es tat den Atem [= Luft] nach unten. Wie das Weib unten eine Öffnung hat, so (war das)"; one may perhaps also compare ChU. 7, 12, 1 .. *ākāśe ramate, ākāśena* (thus should be read instead of *ākāśe na*) *ramate*). So evidently *ākāśān* at JB. 1, 17 and 2, 18 refers to the orifices.

Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 takes *imān* in *imān prāṇān* (JB. 1, 17) anaphoric. This anaphoric use, if ever occurring (see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 209 and Speyer, *Ved. u. Sanskrit-Synt.*, p. 40, 133) is excluded at JB. 2, 18, where no *prāṇāḥ* are mentioned before and *imān prāṇān* means "these *prāṇāḥ* as they are known". Now it is perfectly clear that JB. 1, 17 and 2, 18, as far as the sentence *sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi nirvartate/nirmanthati* is concerned, belong together. So at JB. 1, 17 *imān prāṇān* neither refers back to *prāṇāh* in the preceding sentence, nor should be taken as the goal of the motion (Frenz: "zu diesen Prāṇas"), if at least any agreement with JB. 2, 18 is assumed. Most likely 2, 18 represents the original passage — it contains no problems at all — and 1, 17 is a careless borrowing from 2, 18. The subject *sa* originally was the *prāṇa* which together with the seed enters the *yoni*; the plural *prāṇāḥ .. praviśanti* is not original. Cf. JUB. 3, 2, 5, 5 *yadā hy eva retaḥ siktam prāṇa āviśaty atha tat sambhavati;* ŚB. 7, 3, 1, 45 *prāṇaṃ tad retasi dadhāti tasmād retaḥ siktaṃ prāṇaṃ abhisambhavati.* Together with *prāṇa* the *retas* develops into an embryo. The *prāṇa* (which represents the father and is indeed identical with the father's self now to be reborn in the son) forms the center around which the seed gradually produces the corporeal constituents. By a rotating motion (*manth-*; *vṛt-*, here apparently transitive?) it drives the *prāṇāḥ* (which are developed by the *prāṇa* and not by *retas*) out *(niḥ)* towards *(abhi)* their positions in the orifices. Therefore the son looks like the father, since his *prāṇa* after being enveloped by the seed and later by the corporeal cover succeeds in manifesting itself (in the form of the *prāṇāḥ*) through the orifices *(ākāśāḥ)*.

[6] See Windisch, o.c., p. 116 and Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 f. The participle *sataḥ* seems to favour Windisch' view that we have here a "Gen. absol. in der bekannten Bedeutung", as in a conjunct construction ("Therefore of the seed which is (always) the same", tr. Oertel) it would be quite superfluous.

[7] Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 115 wrongly places a stop after *devalokaḥ* and construes *yad āhavanīya eṣā ha vai devayonir devalokaḥ*. In equations with *yad* and *eṣa-*, however, *yad* never precedes *eṣa-* as Veda Vyasa observes. So the daṇḍa should be placed (as is done in the crit. ed.) after *āhavanīyaḥ*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 9, 3, 10 *devayonir vā eṣa yad āhavanīyaḥ*.

[8] Oertel's reading *atra taṃ karoti* (accepted by Windisch, o.c., p. 116, who regarded *atra* as referring to "die Welt, die dem Gārhapatya entspricht, die irdische Welt", and by Hertel, o.c., p. 151, who assumed that rebirth in this world was mentioned here) was rightly emended to *akṛtaṃ karoti* by Caland, "Emendationen zum Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa", *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 62. Veda Vyasa refers to AB. 2, 38, 11 *akṛtam akar iti vai nindanti* and 3, 33, 1 *akṛtaṃ vai prajāpatiḥ karoti*. See also PB. 21, 15, 4.

[9] *sa yaj juhoti yas sādhu karoti*. Oertel (o.c., p. 116) translates the second clause by "in that he does good" and Windisch (o.c., p. 111 reading *yat* for *yas* and referring to JUB. 3, 3, 5, 6 *yad ... yajante yat sādhu kurvanti tad eṣām ūrdhvam annādyam utsīdati*) renders: "Was er opfert, was er gut handelt .." (o.c., p. 116). Cf. Frenz, o.c., p. 126: "Wenn man giesst, wenn man etwas Gutes tut ..". Is there any parallel for good deeds being placed in the āhavanīya? More convincing is Hertel, o.c., p. 151 who translates: "Wenn er die Opferspende darbringt, wenn er sie gut ausführt ..", and observes in a note: "d.h. wenn er beim Opfer keinen Fehler begeht". Here *sādhu kṛ-*, however, does not refer to a correct performance in general, but to pouring the oblation in the āhavanīya instead of the gārhapatya (which would be *akṛtam* instead of *sādhu*). For *sādhu karoti* meaning "to do it in the proper way; to undertake the right action (in the ritual)" cf. JB. 2, 387 *sādhu haivākṛta yad astoḍhvam*.

[10] Read perhaps *sa yad asmāl lokād* (as at JB. 1, 15) or *sa yo 'smāl lokād* instead of *sa yasmāl lokād* (Windisch' rendering o.c., p. 110 "Aus welcher Welt der so wissende scheidet" does not make sense).

[11] The reference to PB. 8, 1, 4 and 13, 4, 17 which the editors make in their *Studies in the JB.* in connection with this chapter is based on Caland's translation of PB., which in a note on 8, 1, 4 refers to JB. 1, 18, 5 (read 1, 185!!).

[12] All the mss. except one read *sa he ya ttā devebhya*. Oertel conjectures *haiva*, Frenz, o.c., p. 126, n. 33 *sa hetvā devebhya* ("Sobald dieser hingegangen ist, meldet er den Göttern ..."). They base themselves on the reading *haitvā* (or *haidvā*; see Oertel). Retaining the reading of the majority of the mss. and only adding an anusvāra I read *sa heyattāṃ* (= *ha* + *iyattāṃ*) *devebhya*, which fits the context excellently *(iyat .. iyat ..)*.

[13] This may relate to the weighing of the good and wrong deeds. See ŚB. 11, 2, 7, 33 and A. V. Williams Jackson, *Actes 10me Congres Intern. des Orientalistes* (1894), II (Leyden 1895), p. 64-74. No punishment or reward for these wrong or good deeds, is, however, mentioned in this upaniṣad-like passage, which has knowledge of the self as criterion and does not elaborate the archaic motif of *prāṇa* announcing the amount of good or bad deeds. This motif may have been included in the text in order to connect this passage with JB. 1, 16 (*prāṇa* connected with good deeds), whose doctrine that all evil deeds are left with the body or removed by means of the agnihotra it contradicts for that matter.

[14] Compare JB. 1, 49 *te atra māse śarīraṃ cāsuś ca saṃgacchāte*, where body and "spirit" are likewise separated. Since *prāṇa* and *asu* are identical (cf. ŚB. 6, 6, 2, 6) *ayam* stands for *śarīram*. According to Thieme, "Der Weg durch den Himmel nach der Kaushitaki-Upanishad", *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 26 this means a fusion of old and new

conceptions. The one who rises up in the upaniṣadic parallels of this passage would be "der vom Feuer aufgelösste, von Rauch in die Höhe getragene, in verklärter Gestalt weiterlebende Leib". In a note he observes: "Auch das ältere JB. geht zunächst davon aus, dass es der Leib des Toten ist, den der Rauch des Leichenfeuers zum Mond bringt: 1, 49, 7 ff. Im Unterschied zu den Upanishaden versucht es aber diese Auffassung mit der Seelenvorstellung zu versöhnen". The concept, however, that the *asu* precedes the body is a very old one, as appears from ṚV. 10, 12, 1 *(asuṃ ya īyur)*. See Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, Stuttgart 1917[2], p. 529. At ṚV. 10, 14, 8 and 10, 16, 5 the deceased (i.e. his soul?) must unite himself with his body *(saṃgacchasva tanvā; saṃgacchatāṃ tanvā)*. I cannot accept Thieme's view, o.c., p. 26: "Hier (i.e. in the upaniṣads) ist der alte Leib-Seele-Dualismus durchaus aufgegeben". Some passages dealing with the doctrine of the two paths had to refer to the body and its rise to heaven. It should not be inferred that this was the uniform concept in the upaniṣads. The upaniṣadic devayāna-theory has its origin in the speculations on the cremation, in which the body naturally plays an important part. When, however, the process of dying is the subject of speculation, quite different theories are developed in which some kind of soul or spirit leaves the body. See e.g. ChU. 8, 6, 5. It is true that JB. 1, 49 and probably also 1, 18 represent a fusion of two views, but not, as Thieme holds, of an old (soul rises up) and a new (refined body rises up) theory. It is a fusion of two different starting-points, a fusion which might take place at any moment in the Vedic period.

[15] According to Windisch, o.c., p. 117 "unter *tasyaitasya* kann nur der *svargaloka* gemeint sein". Indeed this genitive cannot but refer to a palace or king to be guarded by those doorkeepers. Probably the insertion of this passage (see the introduction to this section) was rather carelessly made. The genitive refers to the sun. Cf. JB. 1, 46 *tasya haitasya devasyāhorātre ardhamāsā māsā ṛtavas saṃvatsaro goptā ya eṣa tapati.*

[16] The elements of time such as the seasons are doorkeepers of the sun because becoming immortal means getting out of phenomenal time. Sometimes immortality is regarded as lying beyond the year (see JB. 1, 46 quoted in note 15), sometimes the year (= the sun, Prajāpati) itself means immortality (e.g. in the verse *vicakṣaṇād* occurring in this section). "Das Jahr galt ... durch seinen mit dem Sonnenlauf identischen Kreisgang als Urbild des Unvergänglichen (vgl. auch ŚB. 11, 1, 2, 12)" (Gonda, *Die Religionen Indiens* I, Stuttgart 1960, p. 190). See also Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration* (thesis Utrecht 1957), p. 186. While night and day are the symbols of destructive time and *punarmṛtyu* (see JB. 1, 6; 1, 11), the seasons are more related with immortality. See ŚB. 1, 6, 1, 9, where spring and winter are the doors of the year (= immortality).

[17] For *prabrū-* meaning "to announce (oneself)" (not "to answer" as Oertel, o.c., p. 117 takes it) compare JB. 1, 22.

[18] On the general interpretation of this verse see my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo ..*", *Z.D.M.G. Supplementa I* (1969), p. 843-848. See also the introduction of this section. The interpretation of the verse by Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11, p. 126 could not be taken into account in that paper. On the whole it is acceptable, but it does not account for the use of the injunctives *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta*.

[19] As an epithet of Soma *vicakṣaṇa-* occurs in the ṚV. See also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 4; 7, 10; 12, 5, where Soma is identical with the moon and called *vicakṣaṇa-*. See also Gonda, *The Vision of the Vedic Poets* (The Hague 1963), p. 193 f. on this term.

[20] JB. reads *prasutāt*, KauṣU. 1, 2 *prasūtāt*. Oertel, o.c., p. 117 does not seem to make any distinction between these forms. Translating "from the begotten one" he concludes that "there may be a pun between *su-* 'press' and *su-* 'beget'". Windisch, o.c., p. 118 considering *prasutāt* to be the correct reading makes it refer to "den zunehmenden, durch das Zunehmen neu gezeugten Mond". AB. 4, 24, 14 f. *(dvādaśāham prasuto bhūtvā)* is, however, not a good parallel and his translation "Nachdem er zwölf Tage ein Neugeborener geworden ist" is hardly defensible. Keith' interpretation "Having pressed for twelve days continuously, having become born anew" is also not convincing. One should take *bhūtvā* with *prasuto* as at PB. 25, 5, 1 f. and probably assume an anacolouthic construction, in which *prasuta-* means "pressing", "pression" (see Renou, "Index védique", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 107). Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928[2]), p. 142 was the first to distinguish *prasūtāt* ("der geboren hat") from *prasutāt* ("von dem einen halben Monat (den abnehmenden Mond) lang ausgepressten"). This undoubtedly correct interpretation was also adopted by Renou, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* (Paris 1948), p. 18, n. 19. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11, p. 106 translates *prasūtāt* (KauṣU. 1, 2) by "[zum Gebären] Angetriebenen". The three roots *su-* "to press", *sū-* "to impel" and *sū-* "to procreate" often coincide in the mind of the Vedic thinkers. See Heesterman *Royal Consecration*, p. 72 f.; 136. For the halfmonthly pressing out of the moon by the gods see also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 4 and 7, 10.

[21] Oertel, o.c., p. 117 takes *ardhamāsyam* with *retas* (cf. Frenz, o.c., p. 126: "halbmonatsalt"), but supposes that *ardhamāsam* may have been the original reading. Presumably it should be taken as an adverb with *prasutāt*.

[22] Hertel, o.c., p. 152 observes: "Der 'Herr der Väterwelt', d.i. der abgeschiedenen Vorfahren, ist der Mond, eben weil er die abgeschiedenen Seelen zunächst in sich aufnimmt". In the version of JB., however, the moon does not receive the deceased. Probably *pitryāvat* just as *vicakṣaṇa* is an old epithet of Soma. In the saṃhitās and brāhmaṇas this god is frequently called *pitṛmat-* and *pitṛdevatya-*, e.g. KS. 36, 13: 79. 10 f. *somam agre yajati somo vai pitṛṇāṃ devatā pitṛdevatyo hi somo. yat somaṃ pitṛmantaṃ yajati somapāṃs tat pitṝn yajati*. Probably *pitryāvat-* literally meaning "who has relationship with the pitṛs" does not refer to a specific function in this context; it is an epithet of Soma, here identified with the moon which is pressed out.

[23] On the injunctives *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta* see "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād*", o.c., p. 846 ff.

[24] In *sa upajāyopajāyamāno* the double sandhi is strange, as the metre requires *upajāya upajāyamāno*. Oertel, o.c., p. 117 translates "As such am I reborn, being born anew". Not rebirth, however, is referred to, but additional birth as at ṚV. 1, 25, 8 *veda māso dhṛtavrato dvādaśa prajāvataḥ veda ya upajāyate*. Man is produced by the year as something additional to itself, as the thirteenth additional month. On the thirteenth month as an addition see ŚB. 6, 2, 2, 29 *upa ca trayodaśo māsaḥ*. PB. 19, 3, 3 *upajan-* also means "to add": *ekaikā stotrīyopajāyate prajām evāsmai upajanayati*. It would be useless here to discuss the interpretation of those scholars who follow Windisch in regarding *sa upajāyopajāyamāno* .. etc. as the alternative speech of those deceased who are liberated and now reborn in a supernatural way in heaven. See my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād* ..". The predicate *upajāye* refers to man's birth on earth. By reciting the whole verse the deceased shows that he knows his divine origin and identity with the year. He is produced *(upajan-)* by the year (the totality of the *ṛtus*) and added *(upajan-)* as the

intercalary thirteenth month which is sometimes (e.g. ŚB. 12, 8, 2, 31; ŚāṅkhB. 5, 8) described as identical with the year itself. This month is also identified with the sun (= the year). See besides JB. 1, 50 also VādhS. 4, 97[b] (*A.O.* 6, p. 217) *sa u vā eṣa eva trayodaśo māso yad asāv ādityas. tasmād asāv ādityaḥ sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ prajananasya rūpam* (note the connection between procreation, sun and upamāsa). In KauṣU. the reading *jāya* (instead of *upajāya*) is against the metre. Bhattacharya's emendation *sa jāyāyā upajāyamāna* (o.c., p. 3) is no improvement. Read with Frenz *sa upajāya upajāyamāno* in KauṣU. and JB.

[25] The instrumental *dvādaśena* (the twelvefold year; the reading *trayodaśena* of JB. 1, 50 seems to be less original) refers to the year as the real father (the earthly father being only a *kartṛ*) by which man is produced and should be taken with *upajāyamāno*. Frenz incorrectly renders "zusammen mit dem Zwölfteiligen".

[26] Read *saṃ* (instead of *samaṃ*) *tad vide prati tad vide* in accordance with the parallel passages. Almost all translators since Böhtlingk have derived *vide* from *vid-* "to know". Geldner, o.c., p. 142 translates: "Mit dem zwölf oder dreizehn (Monate) zählendem Vater weiss ich mich jetzt eins, dessem bin ich mir wieder bewusst". This translation is not possible in JB. Thieme derives *vide* from *vid-* "to find" (o.c., p. 26). For a criticism of this interpretation see "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād* ..", o.c., p. 847. See also *A.O.* 6, p. 150 and JUB. 1, 14, 4, 3 on *saṃprativid-*.

[27] With this line (the correct reading of which was established by Raghu Vira) ends the verse consisting of two triṣṭubh stanzas of which the first two pādas count twelve instead of eleven syllables.

[28] Oertel, followed by Windisch, Hertel and Frenz, needlessly changes *vidvāṃsam* and *jānantam* into *avidvāṃsam* and *ajānantam* disregarding the evidence of the mss. The soul is not ignorant, as is stated JB. 1, 50 *sa haiṣa na manuṣyo ya evaṃ veda*. In Oertel's interpretation an insignificant detail would be expressed with too much stress. The point is that the soul has been accepted by the seasons as one of them, as one who knows his identity with the Year, as an initiated who has given the correct password. Veda Vyasa was right in rejecting the conjectures.

[29] The passage from here to "He approaches that essence of good deeds" occurs also JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1-6.

[30] The sacrificer had made himself a second Self in the sun by offering in the āhavanīya fire, as was stated at 1, 17. Cf. also ŚB. 11, 2, 2, 6 *atha yām etām āhutiṃ juhoti, eṣā ha vā asyāhutir amuṣmiṃ loka ātmā bhavati*. Windisch, o.c., p. 127 compares JUB. 3, 5, 1, 7 ff., where the soul collects the constituents of the body from several divinities. Nowhere, however, is it stated that one receives back what has been offered. Moreover, in the passage of JUB. one asks for the parts of the body, whereas in JB. the sun throws out the ātman because the deceased is not qualified to stay in the sun. The two passages have no relation at all. Because admission to the sun depends on the knowledge of one's identity with the sun, one's name (i.e. individuality) should not be mentioned. A. Coomaraswamy, "Ākiṁcañña: Self-naughting", *N.I.A.* 3, p. 7 too much stresses the anonymity and even adduces the Homeric story of Ulysses and Polyphemus for elucidating this passage.

[31] Oertel, o.c., p. 116 reading with two mss. *pratipattam* translates "Him having hastened into this self, when about to escape the seasons grasping his foot, drag away". Windisch emends *pratipatta* to *pratipanna* and renders "Nachdem dieses Selbst eingetreten ist, ziehen die Ṛtus den am Fusse gepackten fort, indem sie davon eilen" (o.c., p. 127). According to him and

Renou, o.c., p. 24, n. 2 the motif of running away occurs also KauṣU. 1, 4 and 5. The relation to these passages is very doubtful since there is no reason why the seasons should run away. The compounds of *palāyati* do not invariably refer to running away. See JB. 3, 146; *A.O.* 4, p. 40; 6, p. 232 and Oertel, *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts & Sc.* 15, p. 172, who refers to *Petr. Dict., Nachträge* I, p. 298 a. Here the seasons run towards the deceased after he has got back his ātman (loc. abs.; read *pratipanna*) and draw him away. The compound *padgṛhītam* may contain a reference to the *paḍbīśa* by which the dead are fettered. See L. Scherman, *Visionslitteratur*, p. 154 on Yama's "Fussfessel".

[32] Coomaraswamy's rendering, *N.I.A.* 3, p. 7 "Who I am is the light thou art" is untenable. The soul does not directly identify itself with the sun, but interpreting the question *kas tvam asi* as the statement "you are *ka* (= Prajāpati)" he shows that he has understood the speech of the sun. One should not assume with Hertel, o.c., p. 153, n. 1 that the sun is tricked. Idle wordplays and jokes do not occur in eschatological texts.

[33] Hertel, o.c., p. 153 incorrectly takes *svar* as subject: "Darum bin ich, der Himmel, zu dir, dem dem Himmel gehörigen, gekommen". See also Frenz, o.c., p. 127: "Soeben bin ich als Strahlender zu dir, dem Strahlenden, gekommen". The soul (= *ka*, Prajāpati) has gone *(agām)* to the sun *(suvar)*. The adjective *svargya* stresses the identity of *suvar* and *svarga*, which is also expressed by the etymological figure *svar agām*. In the next sentence the identification of the deceased with the sun is completed, as *suvarga* means heaven or sun as well as "going to heaven". See also AV. 10, 2, 31 (*svarga-* = "heaven going").

[34] Compare KauṣU. 1, 6 *yas tvam asi so 'ham asmi*, spoken to Brahmā by the soul.

[35] Windisch, o.c., p. 128 compares this and the next sentence to KauṣU. 1, 4 *sa āgacchati vijarāṃ nadīṃ. tām manasaivātyeti. tat sukṛtaduṣkṛte dhunute. tasya priyā jñātayaḥ sukṛtam upayanty apriyā duṣkṛtam.* With his view, that *apyeti* of JB. 1, 18 corresponds to *atyeti*, and *sukṛtarasa* to the river Vijarā, I do not agree. It is true that at KauṣU. 1, 4 some mss. have *apyeti (sa āgacchaty āraṃ hradam. tam manasāpyeti*, v.l. *atyeti)*, but even if *apyeti* would be the correct reading, we should not with Renou, o.c., p. 22 translate "Il arrive au lac Āra et le traverse", since *apyeti* does not mean "to pass". The mythical description of the path to the highest god of KauṣU. has no equivalent in JB. 1, 18. JUB. 3, 3, 4, 6 *(sa etam eva sukṛtarasam praviśati)* does not refer to passing a mythical stream or reaching a mythical place. There *sukṛtarasa* seems to designate the food which has been stored up by the sacrificer in the moon, even as for an embryo food has been stored up in the breasts of the mother. As the child drinks the milk after its birth so the sacrificer who is reborn in the sun drinks the essence of his good deeds out of the moon. Compare TB. 3, 10, 11, 3, where the good deeds are likewise regarded as drinkable. For *sukṛtarasaḥ* compare JUB. 1, 9, 3, 4 *atha yat para atibhāti sa puṇyakṛtyāyai rasaḥ.*

[36] Cf. JB. 1, 50; KauṣU. 1, 4 and Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 97.

19–20. *Discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya on the substitutes for the normal oblation. Truth is offered in* śraddhā. *The mental performance and the offering in the* prāṇa *during the* pravāsa

For this section see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 23, p. 328 ff., who draws attention to the corresponding passage of ŚB. in the Mādhy. recension (11, 3, 1, 1-8). Caland, "Over en uit het Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa", *Amsterdam Acad.* 1915, p. 33 compares the beginning of this section to the Kāṇva recension (3, 1, 4), which more agrees with JB. than the Mādhy. version. The rest of the passage (with the discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya, of which another version is found VādhS. 3, 40, *A.O.* 4, p. 35), however, is more consonant with the Mādhy. recension. See Caland's introduction to his ŚBK. edition (Lahore 1926), p. 102. However, the differences between the two versions are not great in this part. They mostly concern the expression, e.g. *abhaviṣyat* (K.) / *syāt* (M.), rather than the contents. In these cases JB. again agrees with ŚBK. at the end of the discussion, where the Kāṇvas read *sa hovāca namas te 'stu yājñavalkya vetthāgnihotraṃ sahasraṃ dadāmīti* (cf. JB. *taṃ hovāca vetthāgnihotraṃ yājñavalkya. namas te 'stu. sahasraṃ bhagavo dadma iti*; ŚBM. *vetthāgnihotraṃ yājñavalkya dhenuśataṃ dadāmīti hovāca*). On the relation between the two ŚB. resensions and JB. Caland observes in the introduction to the ŚBK. edition p. 101 that ŚB. 1-5 and ŚBK. 1-7 are younger than JB., whereas the later books of ŚB. "— at least parts of book XI and XII (M.) — seem rather to have been known to the Jaiminīyas". These different relationships are not only based on the fact that ŚB. consists of different layers. One should also take into account that those corresponding passages which exhibit borrowing by JB. from ŚB. are found in the agnihotra section (JB. 1, 1-65) which may be regarded as a later addition. Most likely the present section is later than ŚB. in both recensions. In the introductory passage before the actual discussion both ŚB. versions prepare the conclusion of the debate (*satyam* is offered in *śraddhā*) by equating *tejas* (the flame of the fire) with *śraddhā* and *ājyam* (the oblatory butter) with *satyam*. ŚBK. even explains the latter homology: *satyena hīme lokā ājityāḥ*. ŚBM. omits this (and for that matter looks like an abridgement of the ŚBK. introduction to the debate). JB. even omits these essential equations and thereby removes the connecting element between the introductory passage and the discussion. The introduction is entirely missing in the VādhS. version, for obvious reasons since this text has a macrocosmic substitute (the sun) instead of the microcosmic (truth). On the secondary character of this parallel version see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* V, n. 8.

After the discussion some ślokas follow with a connecting and explanatory prose context. ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 5 introduces this originally independent passage (dealing with a different kind of substitution) with *tad apy ete ślokāḥ*, whereas JB. trying to connect the two passages more closely

makes Janaka sing the interrogatory verses *(atha hainam upajagau)* and Yājñavalkya (specified as the Vājasaneya, which also points to borrowing from ŚB.) the responsive verses. According to P. Horsch, *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur* (Bern 1966), p. 112 the verses of the ŚB. version are "wohl jünger". This view (presumably based on the announcement *tad apy ete ślokāḥ*) does not convince me. Observe that JB. mostly uses the phrase *tasyaiṣa ślokaḥ* and only here (in the younger agnihotra section) has *atha hainam upajagau*.

For the interpretation of the contents of this section I may refer to *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* V B.

19. The agnihotra cow indeed is speech.[1] Her calf is mind. They milk speech whose milk has been caused to flow[2] by mind. They milk the mother (cow) whose milk has been caused to flow by her calf. This mind here which comes first[3] is followed by speech. Therefore the mother (cow) runs after the calf that walks in front. The milkpost[4] is the heart, the rope is breath. With breath indeed speech and mind are tied up (to the heart). With a rope he ties up the calf and the mother (to the milkpost).

Now as to this Janaka (the king) of Videha asked Yājñavalkya: "Do you know the agnihotra (oblation), Yājñavalkya?" "I do" he said. "What is it?" "Milk". "If there would be no milk, with what would you perform the offering?" "With rice and barley". "If there would be no rice and barley, with what would you perform the offering?" "With any other corn". "If there would not be any other corn, with what would you perform the offering?" "With forest herbs". "If there would be no forest herbs, with what would you perform the offering?" "With water". "If there would be no water, with what would you perform the offering?" He said: "Then, indeed, there would be nothing at all here, and yet there would be offered[5] here, namely, truth in faith". To him he spoke: "You know the agnihotra, Yājñavalkya. Honour to you. A thousand (cows) we give to you, Sir".

Then he recited to him (the verse):

> "Does the agnihotrin who stays away from his house have knowledge (of his agnihotra at home?)?[6]

20. — How is there religious inspiration[7] for him in that case? How does he remain connected with (his) fires?" (This means:) "When having established his fires he thereupon leaves home, how is there no leaving home then?" Vājasaneya said:

"He who is the quickest among the beings, is found to be the one that knows (i.e. keeps being aware of his agnihotra) while staying abroad. Thus there is religious inspiration for him then. Thus he remains connected with (his) fires".

Mind he meant by saying that. Mind certainly is the quickest[8] among the beings. "Mentally[9] there is no leaving home for him" he thereby meant to say.

Then he recited to him:

"When he makes a long journey and then neglects his duty (of performing a mental agnihotra) there, in what is that oblation offered by him which they keep offering for him at home?"[10]

Vājasaneya said:

"He who wakes in the beings is found to be the one that knows while staying abroad.[11] In him that oblation is offered by him which they keep offering for him at home".

Breath he meant by saying that. Breath wakes in the beings.[12] In breath that oblation is offered by him. Therefore they say: "The agnihotra is breath". For as long as he breathes with breath so long he offers the agnihotra.[13]

NOTES

[1] JUB. 2, 5, 1, 3 (in an entirely different context) speech is likewise described as a cow: *tām etāṃ vācaṃ yathā dhenuṃ vatsenopasṛjya prattāṃ duhītaivam eva devā vācaṃ sarvān kāmān aduhran.*

[2] With Oertel, o.c., p. 328 and Caland, o.c., p. 33 one should read *prattām* instead of *pṛktām*. See also Hoffmann, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 7. For parallels see Oertel, *J.V.S.* I, p. 163 f.

[3] Caland, "Emendationen zum Jaiminīya-brāhmaṇa", *W.Z.K.M.* 28 (1914), p. 62 f. changes Oertel's *tatpaścā* into *yat paścā* and translates "In dieser Weise, fürwahr, folgt die Stimme dem vorangehenden Geiste". So *pūrvaṃ yat* (see also ŚBK. 3, 1, 4) corresponds to *pūrvaṃ yantam* in the next sentence. Raghu Vira reads *yat* but seems to have a different interpretation, as appears from his punctuation. Probably he takes *yat* as a conjunction and not as a participle. Compare JB. 1, 329; ŚB. 3, 2, 4, 11 and PB. 11, 1, 3 on mind preceding speech.

[4] For *methy (upadohanī)* (not *medhy* as Oertel reads) see PB. 13, 9, 17 (with Caland's note on his translation).

[5] Oertel, o.c., p. 329 conjectures *ahūyataiva* (the reading of ŚB.), whereas Raghu Vira reads *u hūyata iva*. VādhS. has *āhūyata iva*. Here *iva* ("as it were") may be preferable in view of the unusualness of the offering, but after *āsīd* one does not expect a present tense.

[6] Eggeling translates the ŚB. parallel "Knowing what, does the offerer of the Agnihotra stay away from his house". Similarly Horsch, o.c., p. 112 ("Was wissend . .."). The exact interpretation remains doubtful, but so

much is clear that in the responsive verse no answer is given to a question "Knowing what . .". In the answer *sa vidvān pravasan* refers back to *vidvān pravasati*. This does not appear from Eggeling's and Horsch' translations. Presumably *kiṃ svid* only introduces a question.

[7] According to Horsch, o.c., p. 112 *kāvyam* here should mean "Kunstgriff". This interpretation does not strike me as very suitable in the context, since the mental performance of the agnihotra, to which this verse seems to refer, hardly can be called an artifice.

[8] Cf. ṚV. 6, 9, 5.

[9] On the mental performance during the *pravāsa* see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. IV and V, n. 10. Mind being the swiftest, one is able to cross a long distance and mentally be present at the agnihotra which is performed at home if one does not miss the mental agnihotra abroad. Probably *vidvān* and *kāvyam* in the verse refer to the consciousness, the awareness of the sacrificer who every morning and evening has full knowledge of what is going on with his fires (i.e. his second self, his vital powers or breaths) at home.

[10] This verse (= ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 7) was completely misunderstood by Eggeling. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V, n. 12 for Minard's criticism and likewise wrong interpretation. Horsch, o.c., p. 113 correctly interprets the contents of the verse, but is wrong in taking *átha tátra pramádyati* (accent!!) as a principal clause.

[11] *sa vidvān pravasan vide* is out of place here. ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 8 has *viśvā jatāni yo 'bibhaḥ*. Again an indication that JB. is not the source of ŚB.

[12] Read with Veda Vyasa *prāṇo vāva* (cf. *mano vāva*) *bhuvaneṣu*.

[13] On this agnihotra in the prāṇa which is different from the prāṇāgnihotra rite see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V.

21. *The seventeenfold vaiśvadeva-agnihotra. The* sthāṇu *in the agnihotra*

JB. takes together two different subjects in this chapter. The second paragraph only deals with the *sthāṇu* of the agnihotra (for this subject see KS. 6, 5: 54. 8 f.; KapS. 4, 4; MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 4 f.; TB. 2, 1, 4, 3 and VādhS. 3, 33, *A.O.* 4, p. 30), but the final sentence again refers to the seventeenfold agnihotra of the first paragraph.

The text of the first part of this section is very corrupt in the critical edition. The brāhmaṇa mentions a seventeenfold agnihotra, whereas only thirteen stages of the agnihotra milk are found in the edited text. It is worthwhile to attempt a reconstruction of the original text since the critical apparatus contains some obviously correct readings and several parallels are found in other texts. The closest parallel VādhS. 3, 37 (*A.O.* 4, p. 32), an *anvākhyāna* of TB. 2, 1, 7, 1, is used as starting-point in the following outline, which further includes AB. 5, 26, 6-8 (explicitly referring to a sixteenfold agnihotra); MS. 1, 8, 10 and KŚS. 25, 2, 3. The remoter parallels ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 5 and GB. 1, 3, 12 are left out of account in this outline. The left series mentions the stages of the milk; the right the dedication to the deities. The numbers in each column refer to these two series and their order in the text. The second column of JB. contains the version of the ms. *ya* (probably the Baroda ms.), which the editor strange enough has not preferred to the lacunary version of the Burnell mss.

VādhS.	*AB.*	*MS.*	*KŚS.*	*JB.*	*JB.*[2]	*VādhS.*
1 gavi (sat)	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1		raudram
2 upasṛṣṭam (upāvasṛṣṭam)	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2		vāyavyam
3 duhyamānam	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3		āśvinam
4 dugdham	4/4	4/4	4/4	4/4		saumyam (JB. agnīṣomīyam)
5 adhiśritam	5/5	5/5	5/5	7/7		vāruṇam
6 bhiṅḍavaḥ (bindumat; JB. prendavaḥ)	8/8	7/*19*	8/*12*	5/9		vaiśvadevāḥ (vaiśvadevam)
7 (sam)udantam	6/6	8/8	6/6	–/5		pauṣṇam (JB. pauṣṇāḥ)
8 viṣyandamānam (viṣyaṇṇam)	7/–	9/9	7/*8*	——		sārasvatam
9 śaraḥ (śarogṛhītam)	9/9	6/6	–/9	6/6		maitram
[pratinīyamānam	–/12	10/10	——	–/8		vaiṣṇavam]

VādhS.	*AB.*	*MS.*	*KŚS.*	*JB.*	*JB.*[2]	*VādhS.*
10 udvāsitam (JB. pratiṣṭhāpyamānam)	10/—	*11/13*	*11/14*	8/–		dhātuḥ (dhātram)
11 unnītam	——	13/—	13/13	9/–		bṛhaspateḥ (bārhaspatyam)
12 prakrāntam (MS. praṇīyamānam)	11/11	15/15	—/10	10/10		savituḥ (sāvitram)
13 (pra)hriyamāṇam	*12/10*	16/16	*14/17*	—/11	11/11	dyāvāpṛthiv(ī)yam (dyāvāpṛthivyoḥ)
14 upasannam	13/—	17/17	*17/18*	11/12	12/12	indrāgnam (indrāgnyoḥ)
15 pūrvāhutiḥ	14/14	——	18/—	12/—	13/13	agneḥ
16 uttarā	15/15	—/18	19/19	13/13	14/14	prajāpateḥ (prājāpatyam)
17 hutam	16/16	19/—	20/20	——	15/15	aindram

Conclusions: Fifteen instead of thirteen items are obtained by following the ms. *ya* which perfectly agrees with the parallels (especially VādhS.). Compare also GB. *dyāvāpṛthivyaṃ hriyamāṇam*. The same text also connects the first oblation with Agni. It is remarkable that KŚS. agrees with the corrupt, printed text of JB. *(dyāvāpṛthivyor upasannam indrāgnyoḥ pūrvāhutiḥ)*. The sūtra, which does not follow its own brāhmaṇa, but MS. [*unnīyamānam* in twelfth position and other correspondences], AB. [*viṣyandamānam — mārutam 7*; see further the outline] and TB./VādhS. [*unnītam*], may have been influenced by an early corrupted version of the JB. mss. It should be noted that the agnihotra-vaiśvadevam was not always transmitted as a fixed, perfectly understood classification. Sometimes the order of either the left or the right column of our outline was rather automatically preserved, even where the sequence of the other was disturbed. Thus MS. 7 *mārutam* originally belonging to *bindumat* retains its seventh position in AB. and KŚS., but here refers to *viṣyandamānam*. KŚS. now connects *bindumat* (8) with *sārasvatam* (= TB./VādhS. 8 *viṣyandamānam*). If the irregular position of *maitraṃ śarogṛhītam* (6) in MS. is corrected, even in this text *sārasvatam* (with *viṣyaṇṇam*) takes in the eight position. So one may assume one original scheme of equations and several successive corruptions and additions.

Now it is clear that one should start from the oldest passage and by means of agreements between the parallels try to restore the original order of the text. After the first five established items the reconstructed original text of MS. seems to be as follows: *mārutam bindumat* (6) [cf. TB./VādhS. for 6 *bindumat*] *pauṣṇam udantam* (7) [cf. TB./VādhS.] *sārasvataṃ viṣyaṇṇam* (8) [cf. TB./VādhS. and for 8 *sārasvatam* KŚS.]

maitraṃ śarogṛhītam (9) [cf. TB./VādhS.; AB.; and for 9 *maitram* KŚS.]. Only *maitraṃ śarogṛhītam* has been shifted from its sixth position in the text. Strikingly enough this item has the same sixth position in the text of JB. before our reconstruction. The new sequence represents the strictly chronological order of the process of boiling. The eight position of the bubbles in AB. and KŚS. cannot be original.

For the reconstruction of JB. (items 5-9) this implies the following hypothesis. In the correct text *maitraṃ śaraḥ* (thus should be read instead of *maitraś*; see also the editor's "Studies in the JB.") forms the ninth instead of the sixth item and *vāruṇam adhiśritam* is fifth instead of seventh, as appears from the parallels. Moreover the position of *adhiśritam* is not in accordance with the chronological order ("put on the fire" *adhiśritam* and "taken from the fire" *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam* have been placed together). The text has preserved the following remains of the three missing items between *adhiśritam* (5) and *śaraḥ* (9): *pauṣṇāḥ prendavo*. It is significant that all parallels connect *pauṣṇam* with *udantam* (or its v.l.). So we may safely infer that *pauṣṇāḥ prendavo* is corrupt. I propose as conjecture: *pauṣṇ⟨am udantam* (6), *sārasvataṃ viṣyandamānam* (7), *mārutāḥ bhi⟩ndavo* (8). In the lacuna (one line of a mss.?) the missing items could be conjectured with a considerable amount of probability by comparing the parallels. The order is not entirely correct, but it is identical with AB. (items 6-8).

For JB. *vaiṣṇavaṃ pratiṣṭhāpyamānam* (now nr. 10) compare, on the one hand, VādhS. and AB. *udvāsitam* (10) (= *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam*) and, on the other hand, MS. *vaiṣṇavam* (10). JB. *vaiśvadevam unnītam* (now nr. 11; cf. VādhS. 11 *unnītam*) may be compared to ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 5.

As it is translated below the reconstructed text runs: *raudraṃ gavi vāyavyam upasṛṣṭam āśvinaṃ duhyamānam agnīṣomīyaṃ dugdhaṃ ⟨vāruṇam adhiśritam⟩ pauṣṇ⟨aṃ udantaṃ sārasvataṃ viṣyandamānaṃ mārutāḥ *bhi⟩ndavo maitraṃ śaro *[vāruṇam adhiśritaṃ]* vaiṇaṣvaṃ pratiṣṭhāpyamānaṃ vaiśvadevam unnītaṃ savituḥ prakrāntaṃ dyāvāpṛthivyoḥ hriyamāṇam indrāgnyor upasannam agneḥ pūrvāhutiḥ prajāpater uttarā aindraṃ hutam.*

With regard to the relationships between the several versions the following observation may be made. The oldest version (MS.) is followed by TB. A special sixteenfold *vaiśvadevam* is produced by AB. In an *anvākhyāna* VādhS. makes the seventeenfold *vaiśvadevam* of TB. into a special seventeenfold agnihotra (by way of response to AB. ?) and equates it with the vājapeya. JB. seems to borrow this passage from VādhS. as may appear from the fact that the explanation of the identification of vājapeya and agnihotra is missing and consequently their relation remains rather obscure. Moreover the passage on the *sthāṇu* which even in VādhS. is still independent seems to have been secondarily combined with the seventeenfold *vaiśvadevam* by JB.

21. When in the cow it (sc. the agnihotra milk) is sacred to Rudra; when the cow is united with her calf[1] to Vāyu; when being

milked to the Aśvins; when milked to Agni and Soma; when put on the fire it is sacred to Varuṇa; when swelling up to Pūṣan; when overflowing to Sarasvatī. The bubbles are sacred to the Maruts; the film (on the boiling milk) is sacred to Mitra. When (the kettle with the milk) is put down on the earth[2] it (sc. the milk) is sacred to Viṣṇu; when ladled out to the All-gods. When (the officiant with the milk) has set out[3] (towards the āhavanīya), it (sc. the milk) is sacred to Savitṛ; when being taken (to the āhavanīya) to Heaven and Earth; when put down upon (the grass)[4] to Indra and Agni. The first oblation is sacred to Agni; the second to Prajāpati. When it (the milk) has been offered it is sacred to Indra. This is the agnihotra of seventeen parts. Seventeenfold is also the vājapeya. He who offers the agnihotra knowing thus wins both worlds, the world of the agnihotrin as well as that of the vājapeyin.

"There are three stumbling-blocks in the agnihotra",[5] Śāṇḍilya used to say. Offering the oblation on the *samidh* while it has not blazed up forms a stumbling-block. Missing it (the *samidh*) is a stumbling-block. Mingling these two (oblations, by offering the second on the first) is a stumbling-block. One offers on the front part of the stick after it has blazed up.[6] One offers the second oblation beyond (the first).[7] He who knowing thus offers the agnihotra increases his prosperity seventeen thousand-fold each time.

NOTES

[1] According to Monier-Williams *upasṛṣṭa-* means "admitted (as the calf to its mother; also applied to the milk at the time of the calf's sucking)". Although indeed the calf is admitted to the cow, *upasṛṣṭa-* here refers either to the cow *(upasṛṣṭā)* or to the milk *(upasṛṣṭam)*, but not to the calf. Just as *prakrāntam* designates the milk carried by the officiant when he is *prakrānta-* himself, so *upasṛṣṭam* seems to be the milk in the cow when she is *upasṛṣṭā*. Caland's translation *A.O.* 4, p. 32 "wenn hinzugelassen (d.h. wenn das Kalb zur Mutterkuh hinzugelassen wird, um die Milch ins Fliessen zu bringen" is not accurate. Presumably *upasṛṣṭā* is based on the construction *agnihotrīṃ vatsenopasṛjati*. See e.g. JUB. 2, 5, 1, 3 .. *yathā dhenuṃ vatsenopasṛjya prattāṃ duhīta*. The usual construction seems to be *vatsam upasṛjati*. See ĀpŚS. 6, 3, 10; HirŚS. 3, 7, 17; MŚS. 1, 6, 1, 14. ĀpŚS. has *vatsam upasṛjya* (6, 3, 10) besides *gām upasṛṣṭām* (6, 4, 4), whereas ŚB. 4, 6, 9, 9 construes *upasṛjati* with accusative and dative: *upasṛjan dharuṇam mātre* .. See, however, also ŚŚS. 2, 8, 1 *agnihotrīm upasṛjanti*. Anyhow *upasṛṣṭā* is the cow to which the calf has been admitted and not (as Eggeling takes it in ŚB. 1, 7, 1, 10) the cow who has been let loose to the calf.

[2] *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam*, here replacing *udvāsitam* or *udvāsyamānam*, does not occur in the parallel texts. It denotes the threefold resting of the kettle, which is pushed northward over the earth after being taken from the fire.

See BŚS. 20, 20: 43. 9 f. *triḥ pratiṣṭhāpayann ivodvāsayet. traya ime lokā. eṣv eva lokeṣu pratitiṣṭhati.* The connection with Viṣṇu (three steps!) is obvious. Cf. also ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 10.

[3] Keith' unfelicitous translation of *prakrāntam* (AB. 5, 26, 6) "when it is ready (for the Hotṛ)" seems to be based on Sāyaṇa's commentary *prakrāntaṃ hotuṃ haraṇāyopakrāntam.* There is no officiant called *hotṛ* in the agnihotra ritual. Here *prakrāntam* denotes the milk, when the adhvaryu has set out to the āhavanīya. Another term in this connection is *uddruta-.*

[4] Keith renders *upasannam* (AB. 5, 26, 6) by "put (on the altar)". Cf. Sāyaṇa *vedyām āsāditam.* The agnihotrahāvani is, however, put west of the āhavanīya (ĀpŚS. 6, 8, 11; HirŚS. 3, 7, 59; BŚS. 3, 5, 15) or in the nearness (ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 15) on grass. Caland's translation "wenn es in der Nähe (des Āhavanīya) hingestellt ist" (*A.O.* 4, p. 32) is possible, but *upa* in this context perhaps means "upon" rather than "near". The ladle is put upon the grass. See ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 15 *kuśeṣūpasādya*; HirŚS. 3, 7, 59 *oṣadhīṣūpasādayati*; BŚS. 3, 5, 15 *upasādayati kūrce.*

[5] The parallel texts mentioned in the introduction refer to only one *sthāṇu,* the first oblation, which should be avoided when the second oblation is offered. The three *sthāṇus* of JB. may imply that this passage is rather late. The term *sthāṇu* in these contexts is often misunderstood. It is not a *mūla-stambha* (Sāyaṇa on TB. 2, 1, 4, 3), not a "Stein des Anstosses" (Petr. Dict.; Caland, *A.O.*, 4, p. 30). A *sthāṇu* is an obstacle on one's way, here used figuratively, but originally in the form of a short stump upon which one's chariot might strike. Some western interpretators make the Vedic Indians run into pillars and posts, but apart from the fact that pillars probably were not so numerous as to be constantly struck, the image of an absent-minded person bumping his head against a pillar does not fit the context and chariots drawn by horses hardly run into pillars. The chariots and especially their wheels and axles strike upon obstacles like stumps *(sthāṇu).* As an obstacle for chariots *sthāṇu* occurs in the following places: ṚV. 10, 40, 13 *sthāṇum patheṣṭhām* (Renou, *E.V.P.* 16, p. 73 "poteau (souche ici?) auquel se heurte le char en course"); AV. 10, 4, 1 *ratha sthāṇum ārad athārṣat* (Whitney ".. hath run against the pillar"); TS. 7, 3, 1, 1 *prajavaṃ vā etena yanti yad daśamam ahaḥ* (..) *yo vai prajavaṃ yatām apathena pratipadyate ya sthāṇuṃ hanti yo bhreṣaṃ nyeti sa hīyate* (Keith "post"). The parallel JB. 3, 303 *ājiṃ vā ete yanti ya etad ahar āgacchanti. teṣām eṣa hīyate ya upahanyate* proves that *sthāṇu* in the TS. passage is an obstacle for chariots, and that *upahanyate* presumably is on a level with *sthāṇuṃ hanti.* Figuratively *upahanyate* perhaps means "to make a failure" [see Caland's n. on PB. 15, 7, 4; Oertel, *Syntax of Cases,* p. 299 and Lokesh Chandra's n. on JB. 2, 40 *(Gavāmayana)*; Petr. Dict. "anstossen, stecken bleiben im Rezitieren"], but the original meaning seems to be "to strike upon an obstacle with a chariot and become stuck". In Keith' translation of the TS. passage "left out" *(hīyate)* should be changed into "left behind". See also JB. 1, 329 *hīyamānam* (likewise in the context of a race). ŚāṅkhB. 26, 4 (Keith "pillar") and JUB. 3, 3, 3, 5 (Oertel "post") refer to obstacles for chariots. The *sthāṇu* may be an insidious obstacle on one's way, a stump, which like a pit may be fatal for a man who is driving his chariot at full speed on rough ground. The *sthāṇu* of the agnihotra is either an obstacle for the sacrifice (cf. TB. 2, 1, 4, 1 *yajñasthāṇu*), or it is a dangerous obstacle (figuratively: a failure) for the sacrificer: *mṛtyur ha vā agnihotrasya sthāṇuḥ* (VādhS., *A.O.* 4, p. 30); cf. AB. 3, 14, 3 *sarvān pāśān sarvān sthāṇūn mṛtyor atimucya.* In the present passage there is not only an almost concrete stumbling-block represented by the first oblation on which

the second may strike, but another cause for a shipwreck (in the terms of another metaphor) may be the fact that one does not pour the oblation on the *samidh* or pours it on a *samidh* which has not flamed up. See Śaṅkara's commentary on Vedāntasūtra 1, 3, 30 (quoted by Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 356) dealing with the fatal use of mantras without knowledge of their ṛṣi, deity and *viniyoga*: one strikes on a stump or falls in a pit (which is of course only dangerous for people driving at full speed). See also JB. 1, 114 on safely passing a dangerous *yajñasthāṇu*.

[6] *ādīptāyai samidhas samunmukhe juhoti*. Compare BŚS. 3, 6: 74. 20 *tasyām ādīptāyām pratimukhaṃ juhoty* .. wrongly translated "After the fire-stick is well kindled, he should offer the oblation through the beak of the ladle .." (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 92). Dumont, *L'Agnihotra*, p. 126 renders *pratimukham* by "se tenant en face". As appears from the other sūtras, the first oblation has to be offered at a distance of two *aṅgulas* from the *mūla* of the *samidh*, i.e. on the front part. The second is offered behind this frontal part. Does *samunmukhe* here stand for *saṃmukhe*?

[7] Read *atihāya* for *etihāya*. Its object *pūrvām āhutim* has to be supplied. Cf. HirŚS. 3, 7, 74 *atihāya tūṣṇīm uttarāṃ samidhi bhūyasīṃ juhoti*; BŚS. 3, 6: 75. 6 f. *atihāya pūrvām āhutim uttarāṃ bhūyaḥ samidhy eva juhoti*. Cf. also BhārŚS. 6, 12, 10; VaiŚS. 2, 4.

22–25. *Discussion between Janaka and five brahmins on the agnihotra. The sun* (= yaśas, satyam .. gati) *is offered in the fire* (= yaśas, satyam .. iti) *and conversely*

This section was edited and translated by Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 9 ff., who observes (p. 13): "Das ganze Stück erinnert in seinem Afbau an Chānd. up. V. 11 flgg.". Indeed the composition of that passage (of which an earlier version is found ŚB. 10, 6, 1) is similar. Six brahmins visit a kṣatriya in order to have a discussion with him. On the dominant role of the kṣatriyas in these discussions, especially in connection with the agnihotra, see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. II. The subject of the dispute at ChU, 5, 11 is, however, completely different. It compares better with ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 1 ff., where Janaka meets some travelling brahmins and also discusses the agnihotra. Although some motifs in that passage and in the present section are the same (e.g. the offering of the sun in the fire and conversely) there are too many differences which exclude a connection of both passages with a common source.

On the basic theme of the discussion, the offering of sun in fire and fire in sun, see section 9-10 (especially n. 2) and *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V A and C.

22. Āruṇi, Vājasaneya, Barku Vārṣṇa, Priya Jānaśruteya and Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, these[1] were five great brahmins. They (once) said: "Janaka, that king of Videha, is well-informed about the agnihotra. He considers himself superior to us in the dispute. Come, we shall make him discuss[2] the agnihotra".

They arrived there. They said to the pupil[3] (who received them): "Announce us".[4] He announced them. For them, after they had been announced[5] (to him), he (sc. the king) prepared separate seats, separate (dishes of) water, separate *madhuparka* drinks, separate[6] abodes, (in short he prepared) the five[7] obeisances separately to (each of) the five.

Then he went to have a meeting with them[8] having shaved the hair of his head and his beard, having cut his nails and anointed his eyes and body, carrying a staff and wearing sandals.[8] He said to them: "Brahmins, how is it that you have invited us for a discussion?"[9] "You out-talk us".[10]

Then he took the initiative[11] and asked them: "Brahmins, how do you offer the agnihotra?" "You have indeed (again) out-talked us",[10] they said, "since you have taken the initiative and questioned us who are more than one. Gautama,[12] answer".

23. He said: "As honour, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am honour. Honour certainly there will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "What is honour, Gautama?" Pointing at the fire he said:[13] "This is honour" and at the sun: "That is honour. So I offer that honour in this honour in the evening and this honour in that honour at dawn.[14] These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire.[15] These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen",[16] thus he praised.

Then he asked the second: "How do you offer the agnihotra?" He, Vājasaneya, said: "As truth, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am truth. Therefore I am reputed as a speaker of truth".[17] To him he said: "Yājñavalkya, what is truth?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is truth" and at the sun: "That is truth. So I offer that truth in this truth in the evening and this truth in that truth at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen", thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?"

24. He, Barku[18] Vārṣṇa, said: "As the largest (and) best of all properties, O king, I offer the agnihotra, Therefore I am the largest (and) best of all properties. Certainly the largest (and) best of all properties will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "Agniveśya, what is the largest (and) best of all properties?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the largest (and) best of all properties" and at the sun: "That is the largest (and) best of all properties. So I offer that largest (and) best of all properties in this largest (and) best of all properties in the evening and this largest (and) best of all properties in that largest (and) best of all properties at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen" thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?" He, Priya Jānaśruteya, said: "As brilliance, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am brilliance. Brilliance certainly there will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "Kāṇḍvīya,[19] what is brilliance?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is brilliance" and at the sun: "That is brilliance. So I offer that brilliance in this brilliance in the evening and this brilliance in that brilliance at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These

two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen" thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?"

25. He, Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, said: "As the *arka* and the *aśvamedha*,[20] O king, I offer the agnihotra. For the *arka* and the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice are the food of the gods". To him he said: "Vaiyāghrapadya, what is the *arka*, what is the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the *arka*" and at the sun: "That is the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice. So I offer that sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice in this *arka* in the evening and this *arka* in that sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered!", having thus praised, he said: "Assuredly, to him who might tell me what are the goal and the means for coming there[21] in the agnihotra I should like to grant a boon". They said: "We have not studied the goal and the means for coming there in the agnihotra. You must tell us the goal and the means for coming there in the agnihotra. We separately grant you five boons (i.e. each of us will grant you a boon)". Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the means for coming there" and at the sun: "That is the goal. So I offer that goal in this means for coming there in the evening and this means for coming there in that goal at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all thing one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered!" thus having praised they said: "Choose the boons we have granted". He said: "This is my choice: Let me give you separately (i.e. each of you) thousand (cows) and five hundred horses".

These were the reflections[22] on the agnihotra, these were the aims. These very aims he obtains who knows thus and for whom (a priest) knowing thus performs the agnihotra.[23]

NOTES

[1] The series of names, nominatives resumed by the pronoun *ete* (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 22) is concluded by the "comprehensive" *iti* (Oertel, o.c., p. 11). Āruṇi, usually called Uddālaka Āruṇi, is frequently mentioned in ŚB. and JB., but also in other texts. Vājasaneya occurs as Yājñavalkya only in ŚB. and JB. (except twice in ŚāṅkhĀ. in passages borrowed from ŚB.). As Vājasaneya he is mentioned in JB. and BĀU. Barku Vārṣṇa appears ŚB. 1, 1, 1, 10; BĀU. (M.) 4, 1, 8 and JB. 1, 248, where Raghu Vira without giving

a v.l. reads *prakur vārṣṇas* against Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 96 *barkur* (conj. for *prakur*) *vārṣṇis*. See also Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara 6, 7, 15 (ed. Goldstücker, p. 295): Vārṣṇi. His third name Āgniveśya (see JB. 1, 24) is found in the lines of tradition *(vaṃśas)* of BĀU. Priya Jānaśruteya, addressed as Kāṇḍvīya in 1, 24, does not occur elsewhere, but a Jānaśruteya is mentioned JB. 1, 219; 323; 2, 110; 207. Jānaśruteya is moreover the patronymic or metronymic of five brahmins, two of whom (Nagarin and Sāyaka) appear in the *vaṃśa* of JUB. 3, 7, 3, 2 ff. with their third name Kāṇḍviya. A Kāṇḍviya acts as an udgātṛ JUB. 3, 2, 5, 2. Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, frequently mentioned without his third name, is addressed as Vaiyāghrapadya ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 7 and ChU. 6, 16, 1. The appearance of king Janaka and the five brahmins, who often play a role in ŚB., shows that JB. and ŚB. have a common background even in instances where borrowing is out of the question.

[2] *eta tam agnihotre kathāṃ vādayiṣyāma iti*. Cf. JUB. 4, 6, 1, 2 *etena kathāṃ vadiṣyāma iti*, where the mss. read *etatena* instead of *etena*. The correct reading seems to be *etaitena*. For *kathā* meaning "discussion" see AĀ. 5, 3, 3 *nāsmin kathāṃ vadeta*, not to be translated with Keith "nor in this time should he tell tales". See also Horsch, *Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*, p. 19, n. 1 referring for *kathā* ("philosophische Diskussion") to ChU. 1, 8, 1 and ĀśvGS. 4, 6, 6. Another term used in this connection is *saṃvāda* (Horsch, o.c., p. 19). See also n. 9 *(anusaṃvādayatha)*.

[3] Caland, o.c., p. 9 emending *brahmacāriṇam ūcuḥ* to *brahmacāriṇa ūcuḥ* translates "und sprachen (sich) als Schüler (bei ihm einstellend)". I retain with Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 *brahmacāriṇam*. His criticism, however, of Caland's interpretation that it would require *iti* and the middle voice of *vac-* is not justified since Caland did not take *brahmacāriṇa ūcuḥ* as meaning "they called themselves pupils". Raghu Vira and Veda Vyasa read with some mss. *brahmavādinam*, which can only refer to Janaka. The context, however, makes it clear that not Janaka himself, but his pupil is being addressed. That even kings sometimes had pupils, who were studying the Veda and doing other work, appears from JB. 2, 276 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 194 ff.).

[4] Caland, rendering *pra ṇo brūhīti. tān ha provāca* by "'sage uns an'. Da sagte er ihnen an" and supplying "gastliche Bewirtung" as object, refers (o.c., p. 13, n. 8) to ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 2, where, however, *pravac-* is construed with a dative *(tebhyaḥ)* and an accusative (object) and not with two accusatives (*tān* and the supplied "gastliche Bewirtung"). Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 rightly translates "announce us". Compare *prabrū-* (middle voice) meaning "to announce oneself" JB. 1, 18.

[5] In *tebhyo ha proktebhyaḥ* we find a concatenating use of the participle (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 referring to Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 385). For the use of the demonstrative pronouns in initial position — *te hājagmus. te ha brahmacāriṇam ūcuḥ .. tān ha provāca. tebhyo ha proktebhyaḥ .. (atha haiṣām ..) tān hovāca .. (atha hainān ..) sa hovāca .. taṃ hovāca ..* see Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 22, n. 1: ".. das an die Spitze gestellte Demonstrativpronomen *(ta-)* erfüllt in stereotyper Weise die Funktion einer anknüpfenden Partikel *(atha, tatas)* + anaphorischem Pronomen *(a-, ena-)*: Delbrück, Altind. Syntax 211 f.; Oldenberg, Altind. Prosa 20; Minard, Subordination, 80 ff.".

[6] Cf. ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 2 *tebhyo ha pṛthag āvasathān pṛthag apacitīḥ pṛthak sāhasrānt somān provāca;* ChU. 5, 11, 5 *tebhyo ha prāptebhyaḥ pṛthag arhaṇāṃ kārayāṃ cakāra;* JUB. 4, 6, 1, 3 *tebhyo hābhyāgatebhyo 'pacitīs cakāra.*

[7] There are five obeisances, if *udaka-* is counted twice, *hastodaka-* and *pādodaka-* (Caland, o.c., p. 13, n. 9).

[8] *atha haiṣāṃ sabhāga āvavrājoptvā keśaśmaśrūṇi nakhān nikṛtyājyābhyajya daṇḍopānahaṃ bibhrat.* The same sentence is found JUB. 4, 6, 1, 4, where Oertel's conjecture *nikṛtyājyenābhyajya* should be rejected (Caland, "Emendationen zum JB.", *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 75) and *sabhāga* should be read as one word. See Caland, who (o.c., p. 77) referring to ŚB. 3, 3, 4, 14 *(apy asya rājānaḥ sabhāgā āgacchanti)* proposes to read *sabhāgā* or *sabhāgāv* at JB. 1, 271 *(tau hāruṇer ācāryasya sabhāga ājagmatuḥ).* So *sabhāga-* evidently is an adjective, as also appears from ChU. 5, 3, 6 *sa ha gautamo rājño 'rdham eyāya tasmai ha prāptāyārhaṇaṃ cakāra. sa ha prātaḥ sabhāga udeyāya,* not to be translated with Hume, *The thirteen principal Upanishads,* p. 232 "(..) Then on the morrow he went up to the audience-hall". Caland's later interpretation, *JB. Auswahl,* p. 11 "Darauf begab er sich (..) nach ihrem Aufenthaltsort" is not tenable. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases,* p. 12 f., who is right in taking *sabhāga-* everywhere as meaning "going for a conversation, discussion with somebody (genitive)". See also W. Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien* (Wiesbaden 1957), p. 79 f., who interprets *sabhāga-* as "zur sabhā gehend" and *sabhā* as "Gesellschaft bzw. Ort, wo vornehme Leute zu sprechen sind". For going to a *sabhā* compare JUB. 2, 4, 2, 14 *gacchati ha vā etāṃ daivīṃ pariṣadaṃ daivīṃ sabhāṃ daivīṃ saṃsadaṃ ya evaṃ veda.*

[9] *kathā bhagavanto no 'nusaṃvādayatheti.* One of Raghu Vira's mss. and Caland's mss. read *no 'nusaṃpādayatheti* (tr. Caland: "wie vereinigt ihr euch zu uns?"), but the printed reading is preferable. Cf. KauṣU. 4, 3 *saṃvādayiṣṭhās.* Here *anu* may express the idea of "you one by one", i.e. "what are your respective motives for challenging me to a discussion?"

[10] *ati no 'vādīr iti,* the answer revealing the reason of their visit, may be translated "you have been superior to us in disputing" or perhaps "you are superior to us in disputing". On this use of the aorist see Gonda, *The aspectual function of the Ṛgvedic present and aorist* (The Hague 1962), p. 59: "The aor. may even be chosen when the author deals with a process which on the one hand occurred regularly in the past and on the other hand continues to do so in the present. An example is ṚV. 1, 35, 10 *asthād devaḥ pratidoṣam* "the god (= Savitar, the Sun) stands there in the evening" ("steht .. allabendlcih da" Geldner)". Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda,* p. 155 rightly speaks of "der konstatierende Gebrauch des Ind. Aor.". For a similar "Konstatierung" see ChU. 5, 3, 7 *tasmād u sarveṣu lokeṣu kṣatrasyaiva praśāsanam abhūd iti.* In the next answer *(ati vai no 'vādīr iti)* the aorist seems to have its usual function of referring to the immediate or, rather, actual past (Hoffmann, o.c., p. 155: "Der konstatierende Gebrauch des Ind. Aor. ist mit Sicherheit nur dann fassbar, wenn der gemeinte Sachverhalt der ferneren Vergangenheit angehört"). Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 5 *ati vai no 'yaṃ rājanyabandhur avādīd.* Caland, o.c., p. 11 translates "Du hast besser Bescheid gewusst als wir" and "Du hast wiederum versucht uns nieder zu schwatzen". As to its meaning it is to be observed that *ativad-* may express superiority without any specific relation to discussions. See e.g. KS. 21, 10: 50. 9 f.; TB. 1, 8, 3, 2 *tasmāt kṣatraṃ viśam ativadati.* ṢaḍvB. 2, 3, 10 *tad u vidvāṃsam āhur ati no 'vādīr iti* (tr. Bollée: "Others say to (an udgātar) who knows this observance: 'you have outvied us in the dispute'") hardly refers to debates. *ativad-* means also "to overpower, overtrump, surpass, eclipse, be superior", sometimes with an unfavourable connotation. See ṢaḍvB. 2, 3, 10 *ati no 'vādīr iti. tad anādṛtyam;* ChU. 7, 15, 4 *sa vā eṣa evaṃ paśyan, evaṃ manvānaḥ, evaṃ vijānann ativādī bhavati. taṃ ced brūyuḥ ativādy asīty ativādy asmīti brūyāt nāpahnuvīta.* Is this meaning based on *ativad-* "to sound louder, to produce more sound, to drown someone's voice, to dumbfound, to out-talk" rather

than on *ativad-* "to be superior in the dispute"? Cf. TB. 1, 3, 6, 2 *tasmād dundubhiḥ sarvā vāco 'tivadati;* JB. 1, 205 *na mānyā vāg ativaded.* Renou, *I.C.* 14, p. 88 n. 1 regards *ativad-* ("(prétendre) surpasser en parole") as "un terme typique du *brahmodya*". For a different view see Senart's note on ChU. 7, 15, 4.

[11] Taking the initiative in questioning seems to be advantageous. Janaka asks Yājñavalkya as a boon to be allowed to question him *(kāmapraśna eva me tvayi yājñavalkyāsad iti)*. Therefore he may ask a question of Yājñavalkya at BĀU. 4, 3, 1 *sa ha kāmapraśnam eva vavre. taṃ hāsmai dadau. taṃ ha saṃrāḍ eva pūrvaḥ papraccha)* although Yājñavalkya at first had not the intention of disputing: *sa mene na vadiṣya iti* (but perhaps one should read with Dvivedagaṅga *sam enena vadiṣya iti*; see also Renou, *I.C.* 14, p. 87, n.1). Cf. ŚB. 11,4,1, 3 *ho3 gautamasya putretītaraḥ pratiśuśrāva. taṃ hatata eva praṣṭuṃ dadhre* "'Halloo, son of Gautama!' replied the other, and straightway began to question him" (tr. Eggeling). Questioning more persons on one subject offers the questioner the opportunity to show that the different views put forward are only partially correct and only refer to some aspects of the point at issue (cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 4). The questioner is able to round off the conversation by expounding his own vision on the principal matter (as is done by the kṣatriya Aśvapati Kaikeya ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 10 ff. and ChU. 5, 18, 1 ff.). Observe how the kṣatriya Pravāhaṇa Jaivali likewise is a good tactician in the dispute at ChU. 1, 8, 1 ff. and lets the two brahmins talk first. In the present passage Janaka only takes advantage of his tactical position and harldly puts forward something new or important in overtrumping the brahmins.

[12] I.e. Āruṇi.

[13] Read with Caland *upadiśann uvācedam*, since *upadiśan vācedam* (thus all mss. and the critical edition) makes no sense.

[14] Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 2 *gharmāv eva samrāḍ aham ajasrau yaśasā viśyandamānāv anyonyasmin juhomi.*

[15] Caland translates *yatra sarve kāmāḥ* "wo alle Wünsche (erfüllt werden)", but the assumption of an ellips is not necessary, since *kāma-* means also "object of desire, desired object".

[16] *devān rādhayāni.* Caland, translating "Die Götter will ich zufriedenstellen", observes: "Ist *deva* etwa die ehrende Bezeichnung der Brahmanen?" (o.c., p. 16, n. 12). For *rādhayati* meaning "to compliment, to do honour to someone" see TB. 2, 1, 2, 9 (Sāyaṇa: *pūjayati*) and ŚB. (K.) 1, 4, 1, 5 *yo vai brāhmaṇaṃ vā rājanyaṃ vā śaṃsamāno 'nucarati gṛhān me kariṣyatīti yo vai tatra taṃ vācā vā karmaṇā vā rirādhayiṣati ..*

[17] *tasmān mama satyam iva vadataḥ prakāśaḥ* "deshalb ist Helle (Berühmtheit) mein Besitz, weil ich die Wahrheit rede" (Caland). Here Caland seems to regard *iva* as equal to *eva* (on this use of *iva* see Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 15, n. 21), whereas he translates PB. 2, 8, 2; 3, 9, 2 *kṣatrasyevāsya prakāśo bhavati* by "A shining out among the nobility, as it were, falls to the share of him". Cf. PB. 19, 1, 5 "A 'shining-out' among the nobility falls to his share"; PB. 13, 4, 17; 15, 3, 31 "To his share falls the lustre of might". See also PB. 19, 17, 3 *brahmaṇa iva cāsya kṣatrasyeva ca prakāśo bhavati* "he .. becomes a shining-out amongst the priesthood and the nobility" and PB. 25, 15, 4 *ādityānām ivaiṣām prakāśo bhavati* "To their share falls the shining-out, as it were, of the Ādityas". So Caland seems to take *iva* sometimes as meaning "as it were" and sometimes as equal to *eva* in identical contexts. It is true that the Ānandāśrama edition reads PB. 13, 4, 17 *kṣatrasyaivāsya* (which would imply the identity of *iva* and *eva*), but Sāyaṇa bases himself on

the reading *iva (kṣatrasya kṣatriyajāter iva prakāśaḥ kīrttir bhavati)*. The same commentator takes *iva* as a particle of comparison at PB. 19, 1, 5 and 19, 17, 3 *(yathā ..)* and this is the correct interpretation, as appears from JB. 1, 243 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 95 f.) *brahmaṇo 'sya sataḥ kṣatrasyeva prakāśo bhavati vaiśyasyeva rayiḥ puṣṭir ya evaṃ veda* "Wer solches weiss, der bekommt, obschon er Brahmane ist, Ansehen wie eines Kṣatriya, Reichtum und Gedeihen wie eines Vaiśya" (Caland). This interpretation should be applied in all the quoted parallels with .. *iva prakāśo bhavati*. In the present passage Yājñavalkya does not achieve fame on account of the fact that he speaks the truth, but by performing the agnihotra as a truth-sacrifice (on this see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V B) he becomes reputed as a *satyavādin*, a truth-speaker who presumably replaces the actual performance of the agnihotra by his truth-practice. For a different interpretation of *iva* in this connection see D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva *und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa* ... (thesis Marburg 1970), who arrives at the conclusion that "*iva* die Grundbedeutung 'kontingental' hat" (p. 81) and renders the discussed clause "Darum besitze ich, der ich (kontingental =) ausnahmslos die Wahrheit sage, weiten Ruhm" (p. 57).

[18] Here and JB. 1, 22 as well as JB. 1, 248 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 96) all mss. read *prakur* instead of *barkur*.

[19] In view of JUB. 3, 2, 5, 2 and 3, 7, 3, 2 we should perhaps read *kāṇḍviya* instead of *kāṇḍvīya*.

[20] *arkāśvamedhāv iti* .. "Als den Lichtstrahl und das Rossopfer .." (Caland). The multiplicity of its meanings make a translation of *arka-* difficult; the more so as often the ambiguity is intentional. See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, p. 80 f. So much, however, seems to be certain that in the dvandva compound *arka-* does not mean "Lichtstrahl", but must have a ritualistic signification. Already AV. 11, 7, 7 *arkāśvamedhau* occurs in an enumeration of rites. See also TS. 2, 2, 7, 5 *indrāyārkavate 'śvamedhavate puroḍāśam ekādaśakapālaṃ nirvaped yaṃ mahāyajño nopanamed. ete vai mahāyajñasyāntye tānū yad arkāśvamedhāv* .. According to the *Petr. Dict.* and M.-W. *arka-* compounded with *aśvamedha-* refers to a ceremony or rite. No *arka* rite being known from the ritualistic literature we had better follow Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 44, p. XVIII: "In the last two chapters of the "Mystery of the Fire-altar" (Śat. B. X, 6, 4, 1; 4) the Aśvamedha — i.e. the sacrificial horse itself — is coupled with the Arka, the mysterious name of the sacred fire, as the representative of Agni-Prajāpati, the Sun". See also P.-E. Dumont, *L'Aśvamedha* (Paris 1927), p. 5 ff. That in the combination with the Arka *aśvamedha-* is not the rite, but the victim appears from the present passage. Cf. also VādhS., *A.O.* 4, p. 173. For the equation of *arka-* with Agni and *aśvamedha-* with the sun see TS. 5, 7, 5, 2; ŚB. 9, 4, 2, 18; 10, 6, 5, 8.

[21] According to Caland *iti-* and *gati-* are "Gang und Bahn". In the present passage the *gati-* in the agnihotra is equal to the sun. Sometimes, however, this sun is considered to be the final goal *(gati)*: ŚB. 1, 3, 5, 11 (= 11, 2, 6, 11) *eṣa evaikaviṃśa ya eṣa tapati. saiṣā gatir eṣā pratiṣṭhā. tad etāṃ gatim etāṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ gacchati;* ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 15 *atha sūryam udīkṣate. saiṣā gatir eṣā pratiṣṭhā. tad etāṃ gatim etāṃ pratiṣṭhāṃ gacchati.* In the conclusion of the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 1-4 Janaka informs Yājñavalkya: *na tv evainayos tvam utkrāntiṃ na gatiṃ na pratiṣṭhāṃ* (..) *na lokam pratyutthāyinam* "But not even thou (knowest) either the uprising, or the progress, or the support, (..) or the renascent world of those two (libations of the Agnihotra)" (Eggeling). Here, similarly, the *gati* is the goal to which one goes rather then the progress. On the *gati* and *pratiṣṭhā* in the agnihotra see also VādhS. 3,

36 (*A.O.* 4, p. 31). In the JB. passage Janaka does not fully describe the course of the agnihotra oblations (as in the *pañcāgnividyā* of ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6-10), but using the argumentation of his opponents offers the *gati* (the goal of the oblation and the agnihotrin himself) in the *iti* (the means for coming there, the āhavanīya fire) and the *iti* in the *gati*.

[22] *etāni vā agnihotra upāsanāni* "Das sind die Weisen, auf welche man beim Agnihotra Verehrung darbringt" (Caland). This section, however, does not deal with worship, but with mystic interpretations. On *upās-* see Gonda, *The Savayajñas* (Amsterdam 1965), p. 347 f. (giving references to previous interpretations) and Renou, *Presentation Volume C. Kunhan Raja* (Madras 1946), p. 55. One of the meanings of *upās-* is "to approach (mentally and reverentially) so as to regard as, to identify with etc." (Gonda, o.c., p. 348). Renou, *E.V.P.* 1, p. 98, n. 2 gives too much stress to the idea of making an equation in *upās-*. Frequently *upās-* has to be translated by "to consider to be .." without any reference to identifications. See e.g. ŚB. 10, 6, 2, 10 *sa yo haitam evam agnividham ukthavidham puruṣam upāste;* BĀU. 1, 4, 7 *sa yo 'ta ekaikam upāste*; 1, 4, 10 *atha yo 'nyām devatām upāste anyo 'sau anyo 'ham asmīti;* 1, 5, 13 *sa yo ha etān antavata upāste;* JB. 1, 271 *dhūrṣv evāham tad upāsa iti*. Making equations is not inherent in the original meaning of the verb *upās-*, but in the mind of the Vedic Indians, who always consider, regard, approach, stand towards *(upās-)* an object by means of (magic) equations. For the basic meaning of *upās-* see also ChU. 5, 24, 5 *yatheha kṣudhitā bālā mātaram paryupāsate, evam sarvāṇi bhūtāny agnihotram upāsata iti* "Wie hier hungrige Kinder um die Mutter herumsitzen, so sitzen alle Wesen beim Agnihotra" (Horsch, *Vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*, p. 180). In this verse *upās-* should not be taken in its literal sense, but metaphorically: "to sit near with a definite intention or expectation; to stand towards in a definite way; to approach or look at; to consider". As to the present passage one may compare VādhS. 3, 39 (*A.O.* 4, p. 33 f.), where at the end of a discussion on the agnihotra Āruṇi observes: *evam u ha yūyam upādhvā, atha ha vayam upāsmahe* ... Here Caland correctly translates *upās-* by "betrachten".

[23] Caland's rendering "der solches weiss und auch wer solches wissend das Agnihotra verrichtet" does not exactly reflect the Sanskrit *(ya evaṃ vedātho yasyaivaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti)*.

26–38. *The agnihotra of twelve days performed after the agnyādhāna*

This section, which gives an interpretation of the twelve-day agnihotra to be performed after the agnyādhāna (during which the performer has to observe certain rules), seems to be completely original. There are no parallels in the other brāhmaṇas. Ch. 26-36 deal with the twelve days and their meaning. In ch. 37 the passing of this agnihotra from *brahman* and Prajāpati to the human beings has a remote parallel in VādhS. (see n. 34). Ch. 38 dividing the period in quarters (during three days milk as oblation, during three days *dadhan* etc.) makes four equations of the agnihotra with impressive rites like the *agniṣṭoma* and the *vājapeya*. These equations, which are very usual in the agnihotra brāhmaṇas (cf. also JB. 1, 4), are continued or resumed in ch. 40 (with the same turns of phrase *tad vai .. rūpam, .. evāsyeṣṭaṃ bhavati ya evaṃ vidvān ..*). The end of ch. 38 briefly describing the observance of twelve days (as it is mentioned in the sūtras) has a more or less exact parallel in ŚāṭB. (see n. 36). This might imply that the agnihotra section of JB. was also found in the parallel ŚāṭB., but the quotation (with the exception perhaps of the comparison *yathā suyavasān kṛtvā prājyāt*) makes a sūtra-like impression and may have belonged to a lost, old ŚāṭŚS. For the concise statements of the sūtras on these twelve days see BŚS. 2, 20 (translated in *Śrautakośa* I, p. 55); BhārŚS. 5, 13, 5 ff.; ĀpŚS. 5, 22, 13 (and 5, 23, 3 quoting the Śāṭyāyanas);VārŚS. 1, 4, 4. These sūtras agree with JB./ŚāṭB., but do not mention the soma or victim oblation at the end of the period. According to VārŚS. one should offer clarified butter during those twelve days.

On JB. 1, 26-29 see also D. J. Hoens, *Śānti* (thesis Utrecht 1951), p. 44 f., who makes some useful observations on the identifications of the gods with Death, but gives some unconvincing interpretations of the epithets of Death. It is imaginable that Death is pictured as "Licker" (the forest-fire) or "Devourer", but does *prabhūmat* mean "Coming forth" as epithet of Prajāpati-Death? "Srocan" (o.c., p. 44) seems to be based on a misreading of the text, which has *mrocan*. The setting sun is the dying sun which temporarily makes the whole world die.

26. Setting up his fires he should take out (a firebrand from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya) at dawn. He offers his oblation twice in the evening, twice at dawn. This amounts to four oblations. Four feet have the domestic as well as the wild animals. Thus he redeems the being eaten by them in return.[1] Agni named the licking one, forsooth, is Death.[2] Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the earth among the worlds and the god Agni among the gods. To union with the god Agni and co-existence in his world[3] he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

Then having mounted the chariot of smoke he drives up to co-existence with Vāyu. He offers during two days. This amounts to eight oblations. Eight hoofs have the domestic as well as the wild animals. Thus he redeems the being eaten by them in return. Vāyu named the swift one, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the atmosphere among the worlds and the god Vāyu among the gods. To union with the god Vāyu and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

27. Then having mounted the chariot of the stormcloud he drives up to co-existence with Āditya. He offers during three days. This amounts to twelve oblations. Twelve months are a year. The year is this All (= the totality of the universe). What he eats, what he drinks, for whatever he opens his mouth, all that becomes uneaten by him;[4] he becomes one who has undertaken the vow of abstaining from food during his whole life.[5] Āditya named the setting one, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins heaven among the worlds and the god Āditya among the gods. To union with the god Āditya and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

28. Then having mounted the chariot of the rays of light he drives up to co-existence with Candramās.[6] He offers during four days. This amounts to sixteen oblations. Sixteenfold is *brahman*.[7] Sixteenfold are the gods. Of sixteen parts consists this complete All.[8] When doing here an evil deed, (which is) dirt,[9] he is covered over[10] with one sixteenth part (of that dirt?). As a golden ornament[11] turns out to be (pure) gold when it is heated,[12] even so he goes to heaven having handed over the impurity of his evil to his hateful rivals.

[13]He is a hare[14] *(śaśa-)* who is dwelling in the moon. For he controls *(śāsti)* all here. He is Yama who is dwelling in the moon. For he restrains *(yamayati)*[15] all here. Yama named the one who will devour, forsooth, is Death.[16] Having appeased him with these oblations he wins *ūrj*[17] among the worlds and the god Yama among the gods.[18] To union with the god Yama and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

29. Then having embarked in the golden ship of the *svadhā* (= libation to the pitṛs)[19] he steers towards co-existence with Prajāpati. He offers during five days. This amounts to twenty oblations. Connected with the number twenty[20] is Prajāpati. Prajāpati named

the powerful, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the atmosphere among the worlds and the god Prajāpati among the gods. To union with the god Prajāpati and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

30. That which is called atmosphere *(nabhas)*, that is absence of fear *(a-bhī)*. For he who has reached that does not *(na)* fear *(bibheti)* of anything. Therefore it is (called) *nabhas*.[21] He offers during six days. This amounts to twenty-four oblations. Of twenty-four syllables consists the *gāyatrī*. There are twenty-four Vasu-gods. They are connected with the *gāyatrī*.[22] For these Vasu-gods the *gāyatrī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires.[23] In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *gāyatrī* among the metres and the Vasu-gods among the gods. To union with the Vasu-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

31. He offers during seven days. This amounts to twenty-eight oblations. Of twenty-eight syllables consists the *uṣṇih*. There are twenty-eight Bhṛgu- and Aṅgirasa-gods.[24] They are connected with the *uṣṇih*.[25] For these Bhṛgu- and Aṅgirasa-gods the *uṣṇih* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *uṣṇih* among the metres and the Bhṛgu- and Aṅgirasa-gods among the gods. To union with the Bhṛgu- and Aṅgirasa-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

32. He offers during eight days. This amounts to thirty-two oblations. Of thirty-two syllables consists the *anuṣṭubh*. There are thirty-two All-gods.[26] They are connected with the *anuṣṭubh*. For these All-gods the *anuṣṭubh* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *anuṣṭubh* among the metres and the All-gods among the gods. To union with the All-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

33. He offers during nine days. This amounts to thirty-six oblations. Of thirty-six syllables consists the *bṛhatī*. There are thirty-six Sādhya-gods.[27] They are connected with the *bṛhatī*. For these Sādhya-gods the *bṛhatī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *bṛhatī* among the metres and the Sādhya-gods among the gods. To union with the Sādhya-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

34. He offers during ten days. This amounts to forty oblations. Of forty syllables consists the *paṅkti*. There are forty Marut-gods. They are connected with the *paṅkti*.[28] For these Marut-gods the *paṅkti* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *paṅkti* among the metres and the Marut-gods among the gods. To union with the Marut-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

35.[29] He offers during eleven days. This amounts to forty-four oblations. Of forty-four syllables consists the *triṣṭubh*. There are forty-four Rudra-gods. They are connected with the *triṣṭubh*. For these Rudra-gods the *triṣṭubh* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *triṣṭubh* among the metres and the Rudra-gods among the gods. To union with the Rudra-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

36. He offers during twelve days. This amounts to forty-eight oblations. Of forty-eight syllables consists the *jagatī*. There are forty-eight Āditya-gods. They are connected with the *jagatī*. For these Āditya-gods the *jagatī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *jagatī* among the metres and the Āditya-gods among the gods. To union with the Āditya-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

37. Like[30] *brahman*, which has no master, no last resort, nothing standing above it, he rules[31] there. This same agnihotra *brahman* once offered during twelve days.[32] Having offered it during twelve days, fame, glory, (the power of) procreation,[33] immortality, that (all) it extracted. After it had offered this agnihotra during twelve days and had transferred it to Prajāpati, *brahman* went up to heaven.

This agnihotra Prajāpati offered during twelve days. Having offered it during twelve days, knowledge, understanding, deliberation, austerity, (all) that he extracted. After he had offered this agnihotra during twelve days and had transferred it to the gods and the seers Prajāpati went up to heaven.

This agnihotra the gods and the seers offered during twelve days. After they had offered it during twelve days and had transferred it to the primeval mortals they also went up to heaven.[34]

This agnihotra *brahman* offered during twelve days. During twelve days Prajāpati, during twelve days the gods and the seers (also

offered it). Having offered it during twelve days each time they obtained their wishes and desires. How much more (will he obtain these) who offers thus (or: that)[35] during his whole life.

38. He should offer this agnihotra during three days with milk. That indeed is a representation of the *agniṣṭoma*. There is sacrificed with the *agniṣṭoma* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with co-agulated milk. That indeed is a representation of the *vājapeya*. There is sacrificed with the *vājapeya* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with clarified butter. That indeed is a representation of the *aśvamedha*. There is sacrificed with the *aśvamedha* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with water. That is a representation of the *puruṣamedha*. There is sacrificed with the *puruṣamedha* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

[36]The sacrificer himself wearing new clothes should offer the agnihotra in fires that are permanently maintained, not leaving home. Having sacrificed with soma or with a sacrificial victim during the thirteenth night he should dismiss (those fires;[37] i.e. he should give up the constant preservation of all the three fires) as one would dismiss (i.e. sent off) people after having supplied them with provision[38] (for the journey).[36]

The primeval mortals offered[39] this agnihotra during twelve days. Because of it[40] for them (i.e. the mortals who have lived since that time) the cow yields milk, the ox draws, the horse is bridled,[41] the mule serves[42] (man), the elephant is harnessed[43] and draws.

NOTES

[1] *teṣām evaitat pratyāśaṃ pratyapacayati*. This sentence contains two problems: the interpretation of *pratyapacayati* and *pratyāśam*. According to A. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (thesis Marburg 1966), p. 13 *pratyāśam* would mean "nach [allen vier] Himmelsrichtungen" (cf. M.-W.). In the present context, however, this signification is hardly suitable since we need an object of *pratyapacayati* or at least an accusative depending on *prati*. I assume that *pratyāśam* refers to the fact that those animals which had been eaten on earth consume the eater in return in yonder world. On this conception see the story of Bhṛgu (JB. 1, 42 ff.). In the next chapter presumably in order to avoid a *pratyāśa* in yonder world a symbolical abstaining from all food is achieved. The term *pratyāśa* with this meaning would be a hapax legomenon, but *āśa-* is found in compounds (i.a. *prāta-*

rāśa-) meaning "eating" and the verb *pratyatti* (referring to eating in return) occurs ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1 *sa yad dha vā asmiṃ loke puruṣo 'nnam atti tad enam amuṣmiṃ loke pratyatti* "and whatever food a man consumes in this world, that (food), in return, consumes him in yonder world" (Eggeling). On *pratyapacayati* Frenz, referring to TB. 1, 1, 2, 1 f. *atho khalu, agninakṣatram ity apacāyanti* .. ("Weiter nun volziehen sie die Abfindung 'agninakṣatra' .."), observes: "Die Belegstellen im JB für apa-cāy zeigen alle das 'ā' als Wurzelvokal und flektieren nur im Aktiv (..). Es liegt daher nahe, auch p 13, 17.22. [i.e. in the present passage] °apacāyati zu lesen. Andererseits könnte man °cayati auch von √ci ableiten, jedoch flektiert diese nach WhR in der thematischen Klasse nur im Medium. Im PW findet sich für apa-cāy = apa-ci die Bedeutung "scheuen, respektieren, Rücksicht nehmen auf". Besieht man das Substantiv apaciti f. "Vergeltung, Sühne", so findet man für p 13, 17.22 die passende Bedeutung." Frenz' interpretation of *apacayati* seems to be basically correct ("die Abfindung vollziehen"). His emendation *apacāyanti*, however, does not convince since *apacāyati* refers to showing respect to Prajāpati in the JB. contexts, which is quite different from "abfinden". Presumably *apacayati* in this passage is identical to the middle voice *apacayate*. Compare KS. 38, 13: 115. 5 *apāsya nairṛtān pāśān mṛtyor ekaśataṃ caye*, translated by Caland, *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba* III, p. 33 (ĀpŚS. 16, 16, 1) "Ich verscheuche (?) von uns die Stricke der Nirṛti, die hundert und eine Todesarten". It is very doubtful whether *apacayate* means "verscheuchen"; a translation which is not supported by any etymology. As there can be no doubt that *apacaye* in this context expresses the idea of driving away and the meaning "to revenge" is out of place, it may be supposed that *apacayate* here means "to send or drive away *(apa)* by showing honour, to put off, to get rid off in an honourable way". Or perhaps *apa* should not be stressed so much and *apacayati/te* be taken as "to make a compensation *(apaciti)* for or against *(prati)*", i.e. "to buy off, redeem".

[2] On the identification of Agni and death see JB. 1, 12.

[3] For *salokatā* and *sāyujyam* see Gonda, *Loka. World and Heaven in the Veda* (Amsterdam Acad. 1966), p. 113 ff. and p. 157.

[4] Raghu Vira punctuates *saṃvatsaro vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ihāśnāti yat pibati yasmai kasmai cana prativyādadāti/ sarvaṃ tad asyānaśitaṃ bhavati* ... The daṇḍa should, however, not be put after *prativyādadāti*, but before *yad aśnāti*, as the equation of year and *sarvam* is quite current. Cf. ŚB. 1, 6, 1, 19; 1, 7, 2, 24; 4, 2, 2, 7; 10, 2, 5, 16; 11, 1, 2, 12 *sarvaṃ vai saṃvatsaraḥ* and ŚB. 8, 7, 1, 1 *saṃvatsara idaṃ sarvam*.

[5] Instead of *yāvaj jīvānāśakapratī bhavati* read *yāvajjīvānāśakavratī bhavati*, a simple emendation, as *p* and *v* are easily confounded. The vow of fasting during the whole life (here only "symbolically" performed) should avert the *pratyāśam* to which JB. 1, 26 (see n. 1) refers.

[6] The moon usually takes in the fourth position after *agni*, *vāyu* and *āditya*; see e.g. *A.O.* 4, p. 23.

[7] Cf. JUB. 3, 7, 1, 8 *ṣoḍaśakalaṃ vai brahma;* 4, 11, 4, 2 *ṣoḍaśakalaṃ brahma*. In ŚB. Prajāpati is often called *ṣoḍaśakala-*. For the significance of the number 16 see Gonda, *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion* (The Hague 1965), p. 115 ff.

[8] The expression *idaṃ sakṛt sarvam* occurs ŚB. 9, 2, 3, 44 *yajñiyam evaitad idaṃ sakṛt sarvaṃ karoti*, where Eggeling's translation "he thus at once makes everything here fit for sacrifice" does not take into account the position of *sakṛt* between *idam* and *sarvam*. Probably *sakṛt* should be taken as an adverb with the predicate at ŚB. 7, 1, 1, 14 *sakṛd dhaivedaṃ sarvaṃ samudro nirma-*

jyāt "the ocean surely would all at once overflow all this (earth)", but following *idam* it seems to belong to *sarvam*. See also ŚB. 3, 3, 3, 1; 4 *idaṃ sakṛt sarvaṃ paṇyam* "any and everything is vendible here" (Eggeling). In all probability *sakṛt*, which in the JB. passage cannot be taken with a predicate, denotes the completeness of the All or Whole *(sarvam)*. Cf. Greek ἅπας beside πᾶς and see Gonda, *Reflections on the Numerals "one" and "two" in Ancient Indo-European Languages* (Utrecht 1953), p. 70 f. For *sakṛt* in connection with *sarvam* see also AgnPrāy. 4 b (Von Negelein, *Atharvaprāyaścittāni*, p. 90, n. 318) *dharmakāmā 'gnihotraṃ sakṛd eva sarvaṃ juhuyur. nātra bhakṣo 'sti.* On *ṣoḍaśakala-* in this connection see ŚB. 13, 2, 2, 13; ŚāṅkhB. 8, 1; 16, 4; 17, 1; 22, 6 *ṣoḍaśakalaṃ vā idaṃ sarvam* and Gonda, *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, The Hague 1965, p. 121.

[9] In *ripraṃ pāpaṃ karma* the meaning of *ripram* is "taint". It stands in apposition to *pāpaṃ karma*. On the other hand *ripra-* occurs as an adjective (e.g. ŚB. 5, 4, 3, 24 *ripratara-*) and means "vile, bad".

[10] *tata-*, p.p.p. of *tan-*, means "covered over by (instr.)", a usage not found in other Vedic texts.

[11] *pravṛtta-* seems to be identical with *pravarta*, a particular round ornament. Cf. ŚB. 5, 4, 3, 24. Or should we read *pravṛktas* (Oertel, *J.V.S.* 1, p. 136)?

[12] For the comparison see also JB. 1, 10.

[13] From here to the end of JB. 1, 28 see Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 13 f.

[14] The black spot in the moon, the *candramasi kṛṣṇam* (ŚB. 1, 2, 5, 18; TB. 1, 1, 3, 3; AB. 4, 27, 7), is considered to be a hare. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 5, 3.

[15] Cf. ŚB. 14, 1, 3, 4 *eṣa vai yamo ya eṣa tapaty eṣa hīdaṃ sarvaṃ yamayaty etenedaṃ sarvaṃ yatam.* Caland, o.c., p. 13 emends *yamiti*, the reading of his mss., to *yamati*. Oertel's superior conjecture *yamayati* (*JB. Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 65 f.), confirmed by one of Raghu Vira's mss., should be adopted.

[16] *eṣa mṛtyur yad yamo 'tsyann eva nāma.* Cf. VādhS. 3, 19 (*A.O.* 4, p. 19 f.) *sa u ha vā eṣa eva mṛtyur yad agniḥ; sa prajāpatim atsyato rūpeṇānvāgacchat.* See also VādhS. 4, 109 (*A.O.* 6, p. 232) *sa prajāpatim atsyato rūpeṇābhipalāyata.*

[17] *ūrj-*, the *loka* connected with the moon, refers to the strengthening juice of the rain which comes from the moon and enters the plants (see section 7-8, n. 3).

[18] Caland's punctuation and translation of this sentence (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 13 f.) is untenable as Veda Vyasa also observed.

[19] Just as the chariot of smoke was connected with Agni, the chariot of the stormcloud with Vāyu and the chariot of the rays of light with Āditya, so the golden ship of the *svadhā* is connected with the moon. The pitṛs are living at the moon according to some Indian traditions.

[20] The *saviṃśa* stoma is equated with the year (likewise a manifestation of Prajāpati) ŚB. 8, 4, 1, 15. Prajāpati is connected with the number twenty-one, so he is *sa-viṃśa* "having the number twenty in his own number", a "twen".

[21] *nabhas* is "etymologically" explained as *na* (negation) and **bhas* "fear". *abhī-* is a hapax legomenon.

[22] The eight Vasus, constantly homologized with the eight-syllabic *gāyatrī*, here agree in number with the *gāyatrī* stanza of twenty-four syllables. Indeed the "numbers have no specific value in themselves"; "the essential point is the formation of the number, rather than its size" (Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, p. 34 f.).

[23] *kāmān nikāmān.* For this kind of stylistic repetition see Gonda, *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda* (Amsterdam Acad. 1959), p. 204 ff.

[24] Instead of associating the Bhṛgvaṅgiras, whose number is not fixed, with the 28-syllabled *uṣṇih*, GB. more logically connects these two combined groups of gods with the two combined metres *uṣṇih* and *kakubh* (1, 2, 24; 1, 5, 25).

[25] Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 13 takes *bhṛgvaṅgiraso devās ta uṣṇiham anvāyattās* .. as an instance of the "proleptic nominative", but Raghu Vira's punctuation (daṇḍa after *devāḥ*) is evidently correct. The initial position of the demonstrative pronoun *(ta uṣṇiham ..|tebhya uṣṇig ..)* is quite usual. See section 22-25, n. 5.

[26] The Viśve Devas are frequently associated with the *anuṣṭubh*. See A. Weber, *Ueber die Metrik der Inder* (= *Indische Studien* 8), Berlin 1863, p. 39. This connection seems to be based on numeral symbolism (on which see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 130 f. for further literature). In order to understand the present correlation one has to consider the position of the *anuṣṭubh* among the Vedic metres, which are arranged in two series: a) The *sapta chandāṃsi caturuttarāṇi* of which the total number of syllables in a stanza increases by four (Weber, o.c., p. 20 f.). b) The three chief metres *gāyatrī*, *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* supplemented with the *anuṣṭubh* and sometimes extended to five *(paṅkti)* or six *(atichandas)*. Weber, o.c., p. 16 f. remarks on the latter series "dass es sich hierbei nicht um ein in strikter Gleichförmigkeit ansteigendes metrisches System handelt, sondern vielmehr um eine Gruppirung, welche auf dem mystischen Grunde der grösseren oder geringeren Heiligkeit der betreffende Metra und der mit denselben in Beziehung gebrachten Gegenstände beruht". The system is, however, undoubtedly based on the increasing number of syllables. The difference with the first series is that in the first three metres only the syllables of the pāda are counted (8, 11, 12), whereas the total number of the syllables in the stanzas of the next metres form an increasing series: 32 (= 4 × 8); 40 (= 5 × 8); 56 (= 7 × 8). Unlike the *caturuttarāṇi* all these metres form unmixed stanzas. Now in numeral symbolism the principle of the element added to a totality is important. See Heesterman, o.c., p. 35 and Bergaigne, *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda*, II (Paris 1883), p. 123 ff. This element, surpassing, summarizing and encompassing the entities of the fixed series which it closes is represented in the metrical classifications by the *virāj*, the eight metre added to the *sapta caturuttarāṇi* (Weber, o.c., p. 20 f.), by the *anuṣṭubh* which encompasses the three chief metres, by the *paṅkti*, centre in cosmic equations (Heesterman, o.c., p. 36; Gonda, o.c., p. 131) and by the *atichandas* uniting in itself all metres (Weber, o.c., p. 64 f.). The number four, often one-sidedly regarded as comprising a triad and a fourth, secret element (the *turīyaṃ padam*) sometimes has an encompassing function, as appears from TS. 4, 2, 1, 1, where the three chief metres are homologized with earth, atmosphere, heaven and the *anuṣṭubh* with the quarters (symbol of totality). Compare also the classification of GB. 1, 5, 15 in which the fourth element (*apas, candramās, viśve devāḥ, anuṣṭubh* etc.) is equated with *sarvam*. The inclusive character of the *anuṣṭubh* as fourth additional element appears from several passages, of which I mention here TS. 5, 1, 3, 5 *sarvāṇi chandāṃsi paribhūḥ*; JB. 1, 285 *anuṣṭubham eva sarvāṇi chandāṃsy upāsmahe*; PB. 6, 3, 14 *eṣā vā anuṣṭup sarvatrāpiḥ savanāny anvāyattā*; JB. 1, 284 *api vā etasyai prātassavane 'pi mādhyaṃdine savane 'pi tṛtīyasavane 'pi vā etasyai brahmany api kṣatre 'pi viśy api vā etasyā asmin loke 'py antarikṣe 'py amuṣmin. sa ya evam etām anuṣṭubham sarvatrāpīnaṃ veda sarvatra haivāsyāpi puṇyo bhavati*. Perhaps also JB. 1, 120 *tad evānuṣṭubh āntād anvāyattā* does not refer to the fact that the *anuṣṭubh* is added to the three metres, as Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 28

supposes ("die Anuṣṭubh ist ihnen hinter (?) angehängt"), but to its being correlative to all of them. The usual meaning of *anvāyatta-* is "connected with, identical, associated". The gods try to reach heaven by means of the *anuṣṭubh* and not the *gāyatrī*, *triṣṭubh* or *jagatī*, because it is completely (literally "to the end" *āntād*; for *āntād* cf. JB. 1, 284; for *ā* + abl. see Minard, *Trois Enigmes* I, § 156 b; here *āntād* = *āntam*) equal to all of them. Being homologized to *vāc* it includes all metres TB. 1, 7, 5, 5; JB. 1, 276. The authors of the brāhmaṇas explain this encompassing nature of the *anuṣṭubh* by the following calculations: 8 + 11 + 12 + 1 (= *vāc*, the *nidhana* of the *yajñāyajñīya*; i.e. the *anuṣṭubh* itself as the extra element representing the totality, added to a sum or whole) = 32 (JB. 1, 284 f.; 2, 101 f.; PB. 10, 5, 9 f.); 8 + 1 (the *him* sound) + 11 + 12 = 32 (PB. 6, 3, 13). The *anuṣṭubh* is equated with the *virāj* of 33 syllables (Weber, o.c., p. 22 f.), an identification not only based on the "nahezu völlige Gleichheit der Silbenzahl" (Weber, o.c., p. 61), but also on the identity of function, both representing the totality of the metres.

Turning now to its divine correlate, the All-gods, we observe the same encompassing function. See JB. 1, 238-240 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 92 ff.), where the Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas and finally the Viśve Devas praise Agni. The stoma is called *vaiśvadeva-* because *viśveṣāṃ haiva devānāṃ purā stoma āsa* (JB. 1, 240). So the Viśve Devas are a separate group of gods and at the same time all above mentioned gods, but not all *(sarve)* gods who were in search of food *(tam etam annaṃ jigivāṃsaṃ sarve devā abhisamāgacchanta)*, for those who had no share in the sacrifice (i.e. those who were not mentioned in the enumeration closed by the Viśve Devas) perished with hunger. For this double aspect of the All-gods see Renou, *E.V.P.* 4, p. 6; Dumézil, *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus* 4 (Paris 1948), p. 156; idem, *L'Héritage Indo-Européen à Rome* (Paris 1949), p. 214, where he observes that the expression *viśve devāḥ*, denoting all gods and not a separate group, "sert alors soit à désigner en bref la totalité du monde divin [see e.g. ŚB. 13, 5, 3, 1 *viśve vai sarve devās* . . ; cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 14; 5, 2; GB. 2, 1, 20], soit à résumer et éventuellement à compléter une énumeration de catégories divines déjà faite [see above]". One may, however, doubt that in this last function the Viśve Devas always refer to all the gods and not to a separate group with preference for the final position. See Renou, o.c., p. 7; 10. Probably the Viśve Devas are: a) all gods; b) a separate group of gods in final position including all the preceding gods as the element added to a whole; c) a separate group in final position, added for the sake of completeness and for fear of omitting a god; d) an entirely separate group. Dumézil, *Héritage*, p. 214 ff. takes the Viśve Devas who are equated with the vaiśyas as a separate group of gods in contrast with all gods (see quotation above). Actually, however, the identification of the Viśve Devas with the third class *(viś)* is not primarily based on an etymological relationship, but on the fact that the third position implies the final, completing position. The third *savana* is connected with the All-gods. The third day of the *pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha*, related with them, is regarded as the end: *antas tṛtīyam ahaḥ* (AB. 5, 2, 11). Cf. PB. 19, 12, 8 calling the *anuṣṭubh* the *anto* . . *chandasām*. The fact that it is called "the end of the metres" is not due to its being created from Prajāpati's feet (as Caland supposes). Because it was the last of the metres, it is considered to have sprung from Prajāpati's extremities, from his feet. The Viśve Devas in third position are not only the last of the series (cf. AB. 8, 6, 3, for an equation with the last of the *caturuttarāṇi* metres), but they also include and are equal to the two constantly preceding gods Agni and Indra, as appears from ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 14 ff., where Agni and Indra

together correspond to the Viśve Devas. They are placed in the centre, the well-known encompassing element, at ŚB. 8, 6, 1, 9. In the discord between the gods they are associated with Bṛhaspati in fifth and last position at TS. 6, 2, 2, 1; in fourth and last position at AB. 1, 24, 4, whereas ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 argues against TS. 6, 2, 2, 1 (and not against AB. 1, 24, 4 as Eggeling holds) that the Viśve Devas are not a separate fifth group, but are identical with the four parties of gods mentioned. We should not assume with Weber, *Indische Studien* 13, p. 268 that the occurrence of the Viśve Devas as fourth or fifth group in the sixth and eight books of ŚB. is incompatible with ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 and a proof for the thesis that these books belong to a different stratum of ŚB. As fourth and fifth group the All-gods encompass the other gods being indeed, in a certain sense, identical with the groups of the other gods. However in the quarrel of the gods as described at ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 the separateness of those groups is stressed. In that context the Viśve Devas could hardly be the final, encompassing element. That is why TS. 2, 2, 11, 5; MS. 3, 7, 10: 90. 1 f.; KS. 24, 9: 100. 4 do not mention them and ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 even excludes them.

So we may conclude that the identification of the *anuṣṭubh* with the Viśve Devas is based on their peculiar position at the end of a series in which they may act as a separate entity and at the same time as the encompassing totality. The fact that the number of the All-gods (33) almost coincides with that of the syllables may have been of secondary influence.

[27] The number of the Sādhyas is unknown. They are nowhere associated with the *bṛhatī*. Perhaps as the celestial gods par excellence they are here homologized with the *bṛhatī*, the symbol of heaven.

[28] The *paṅkti*, consisting of five *pādas* and being the fifth metre in both classifications, is equated with all which is fivefold or comes fifth. The Maruts sometimes are the fifth group of gods, e.g. JB. 2, 25; 3, 152; ŚB. 14, 4, 2, 24. The fifth day of the *pṛṣṭhya ṣaḍaha* is associated with the *paṅkti* as well as with the Maruts ŚāṅkhB. 23, 3. They are (but not in fifth position) connected with the *paṅkti* ŚB. 10, 3, 2, 10 (where the Viśve Devas are related to the *anuṣṭubh*).

[29] The editors' *Studies in the JB.* refer (ad JB. 1, 35) to PB. 6, 7, 10. In Caland's note on PB. 6, 7, 10 (in his translation of that text) should be read 1, 85.

[30] Here *na* should be taken as a particle of comparison and the sacrificer as the subject since it is inconceivable that *brahman* (as the subject of the sentence) would not shine or rule somewhere. This use of *na* is not found in the brāhmaṇas according to Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar for Students*, p. 236. It is no longer understood while occurring in a verse ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 30. See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 446: "Erreur précieuse puisqu' elle atteste que *na* comparateur était sorti de l'usage au point de n'être plus compris dans un mantra. Mais témoignage qu'il est malaisé d'accorder avec les efforts faits par Lüders SBBerl. 1916 298 et 304 pour le retrouver dans les Up. (Ren. 520)". Actually, however, Lüders tried to demonstrate that the upaniṣads (i.c. ChU. 4, 3, 7) surely did not understand this *na* occurring in an old verse and that the brāhmaṇas (i.c. JUB. 3, 1, 2, 4) probably did neither (o.c., p. 304: ". . dessen wahre Bedeutung vielleicht schon der Brāhmaṇakommentator nicht mehr kannte"). The use of this *na* in the prose of a brāhmaṇa which is not one of the oldest is very peculiar.

[31] *virājati* might also mean "to shine out, be glorious".

[32] *dvādaśāham*, taken with *agnihotram* as an adjective by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 77, evidently is an adverb, as appears from the end of JB. 1, 37:

tad dvādaśāhaṃ dvādaśāhaṃ (iter. adv.) *hutvā kāmān nikāmān āpuḥ. kim u ya evaṃ yāvajjīvaṃ* (adv., on a line with *dvādaśāhaṃ*) *juhuyāt.*

[33] All the mss. have *prajāpatim*, but one should read with Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 77 *prajātim*. Compare JB. 1, 56, where all the mss. read *prajāpatir* and Raghu Vira rightly conjectures *prajātir*.

[34] On this passing of the agnihotra from brahman to Prajāpati, to the gods and ṛṣis and ultimately to man see also VādhS. 3, 21 (*A.O.* 4, p. 22 f.): *tad vā etat prajāpatir evam agnihotram ajuhot* (..) *abhi suvargaṃ lokam ajayat; tat prajāpatiḥ suvar yan putrebhyo devebhyaḥ prāyacchat; tad devā ajuhavus* (..) *abhi suvargaṃ lokam ajayaṃs; tad ṛṣayaḥ suvar yantaḥ putrebhyo brāhmaṇebhyaḥ prāyacchaṃs* ...

[35] *enaṃ* of the critical eidition cannot be retained and should be emended either to *enad* (thus reads Caland's transcription of the ms. at the University Library Utrecht) or to *evaṃ*.

[36] This passage occurs with some small difference ĀpŚS. 5, 23, 3 as a quotation from the Śāṭyāyani Brāhmaṇa. See Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 18, p. 40 f. and Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 91. ŚāṭB. mentions a period of thirteen days against JB., ĀpŚS. 5, 22, 13 and other sūtras a period of twelve days. Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 6 f. classes this passage among those quotations which may originally have been identical verbally, but which exhibit small differences caused by carelessness in quoting. Indeed *trayodaśarātram* of ŚāṭB. has evidently crept in under influence of *trayodaśīṃ rātriṃ* which is omitted by ŚāṭB., but perfectly makes sense in JB. (whereas *trayodaśarātram* is contrary to all evidence of the sūtras).

[37] The object of *utsṛjeta* is *agnīn*, as also appears from ŚāṭB. It has to be taken from *agniṣu* in the preceding sentence.

[38] Instead of *yathā sāvasān kṛtvā prārjayet* ŚāṭB. reads *yathā suyavasān kṛtvā prājyāt*, translated by Caland (ĀpŚS. 5, 23, 3) "Es ist dies, als ob er die Zugtiere, nachdem er sie während einer Reise gut gefüttert hat, antreiben würde". For a similar translation see *Śrautakośa* I, *Engl. Section*, p. 62. The point of comparison is, however, that the fires which one dismisses, i.e. allows to extinguish, receive an extra-portion of food (*soma* or *paśu*) on the day of their dismissal, just as people are supplied with provisions at the moment they are sent away for a long journey. The reading of JB. seems to be preferable since the comparison between the dismissal of the fires and the dismissal of people undertaking a journey looks more suitable than the ŚāṭB. comparison. On *avasam* see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 18 (in a note on JB. 2, 8): "*avasa* signifying "food, provisions, viaticum" is a Saṃhitā word (..). It does not occur in the other Brāhmaṇas". See, however, ŚB. 2, 6, 2, 17, where *avasa-* is found and the compound *sāvasa-* occurs in the same context with the verb *arj-*: *avasena vā adhvānaṃ yanti. tad enaṃ sāvasam evānvavārjati* .. "(supplied) with provisions people indeed set out on a journey: hence he thereby dismisses him supplied with provisions .." (Eggeling). For *sāvasa-* see also JB. 1, 165 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 63). On the strength of *anvavārj-* at ŚB. 2, 6, 2, 17 one may assume that *prārjayati* also means "to dismiss". The dictionaires do not give this meaning. The tenth present class does not change the meaning of the root *arj-*. Compare JB. 3, 307 *yajñam evainad āptvā viṣṛjante* (..) *sa yathā nyokasaṃ gāṃ saṃyujya prārjayed evam evaitad vācaṃ ca yajamānaṃ ca saṃyujya prārjayanti* (see also Oertel, *J.V.S.* 1, p. 136 f.).

[39] The critical edition reads here and in the preceding chapter *juhuvāṃ cakruḥ*, whereas Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 113 f. reads *juhavāṃ cakruḥ (cakāra)*.

[40] A remote parallel is found ŚB. 13, 1, 9, 3 ff. *tasmāt purā dhenur dogdhrī jajñe .. tasmāt purānaḍvān voḍhā jajñe .. tasmāt purāśvaḥ sartā jajñe ..*

[41] *ādadhānaḥ prahito 'svo* is evidently corrupt. It must form a syntactical unit since *ādadhānaḥ* can hardly be taken with the preceding noun *anaḍvān*. In order to restore the correct reading one has to consider first what is the general thought expressed in this sentence. This seems to be that the animals were domesticated as a result of the twelve-day agnihotra. The specific faculty of the horse is running fast (cf. n. 40). Here, however, the text refers to domestication *(adhikakṣyo!!)*. Just as the elephant is put in *(adhi)* a girth *(kakṣyā)*, so the horse is put in a bit and bridle. All the mss. except one read *ādhānaḥ* and most of them *pratihito*. The bit of a bridle is called *ādhānam* (see M.-W., s.v.). Cf. TS. 6, 5, 9, 1 f.; KS. 28, 9: 163. 18; KapS. 44, 9; MS. 4, 7, 4: 98. 16; TB. 1, 6, 3, 9. An emendation like *ādhānapratihito* would not seem to be too bold. It easily accounts for the corruptions: *ādhāna* became separated from *pratihito* and came to be written *ādhānaḥ* and later corrected into *ādadhānaḥ*. The, then meaningless, term *pratihito* (from *prati-dhā*) was changed into *prahito* (from *pra-hi-*) "urged on, running, speeding" in order to obtain a significant attribute of the horse.

[42] *upatiṣṭhati* "to be subservient to man, e.g. as a beast of burden".

[43] For *adhikakṣya-* (see n. 41), a bahuvrīhi meaning *adhi kakṣyāyāṃ san*, compare Caland, "Über das Rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana", *Abh. K.M.* 12, 1 (Leipzig 1903), p. 62 referring to BŚS. 11, 6 and 12, 7, where this term likewise relates to elephants ("mit den Gurten versehen").

39–41. *Systematic treatment and interpretation of the agnihotra ritual from the beginning to the end*

In ch. 39 the ritual from the milking of the cow to the ladling out is succinctly described. The main stress falls on the formulas used. Hardly any brāhmaṇa interpretations are found in this chapter. Several formulas do not occur in the sūtras. The incidental agreements with single texts mentioned in the notes do not seem to warrant definite conclusions; the less so as the agnihotra brāhmaṇas hardly contain any formulas.

Ch. 40 mainly deals with the fourfold ladling out of the milk and its equation with four other sacrifices. For these identifications — the agnihotra is frequently homologized with other rites — see e.g. TB. 2, 3, 7, 2 ff., where the agnihotra is equal to Full- and New-Moon sacrifices, the Four-monthly sacrifices, the *paśubandha*, the soma sacrifice and the *saṃvatsara sattra*. For other homologies see *A.O.* 4, p. 20 (offering the milk from the four teats of the cow means performing four great sacrifices) and 6, p. 151 (substitution of the agnihotra by the soma sacrifices). Similar equations (with the same turns of phrase, see the introd. of 26-38) are found in ch. 38.

Ch. 41 connects the ritual actions after the offering with several deities and ominous powers who are appeased and propitiated. Many parallels are found in the sūtras, but this subject (the so-called *vaiśvadevam*) already appears in the oldest texts. See KS. 6, 5: 54. 11 ff.; MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 15 ff.; TB. 2, 1, 4, 6 ff.; ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 (ed. Sarma 2, 3); ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 1 ff.; GB. 1, 3, 12. A rather simple version is found in KS. Supposedly the very elaborate treatment of this subject in JB. (with many details in agreement with the sūtras) points to the comparative lateness of this agnihotra section in JB.

39. After having united the agnihotra cow (with her calf) he says: "Those who are united are Heaven and Earth. The Rudras collect what has been milked by the Vasus".[1] (With the formula) "Ye are the prosperity-bringing ones, danger coming from abroad (in the form of a raid) has been pushed away"[2] he pushes the coals away (out of the gārhapatya). Then he puts (the milk) on (these coals with the formula) "Thou art put on Vaiśvānara's (fire).[3] May Agni not consume thy glow.[4] For truth, thee". Then he illuminates (the milk by holding a burning stick or grassblade over it with the formula) "(Be) light (united) with light".[5] Then he pours water on it (with the formula) "Fill up (or: mix) thyself with thy sap which has entered into the waters".[6] What the waters consume of it then, that he thereby pours on it again.[7] (With the formula) "Excluded is the

Rākṣasa race, excluded are the Adversities *(arātis)*"[8] he thrice passes a fire sunwise round (the milk). Then he removes (the milk from the coals and puts it down on the earth with the formula) "Fix heaven, fix the atmosphere, fix the earth, fix (= establish here) progeny and cattle for me, the sacrificer".[9] (With the formula) "Ye are the welfare-bringing ones, danger coming from abroad has been pushed back"[10] he pushes back the coals (into the gārhapatya). Then having taken the dipping spoon *(sruva)* and the offering spoon *(sruc)* he purifies them by heating them over the fire (with the formula) "Burnt is the Rākṣasa race, burnt are the Adversities".[11] Then he rubs the offering spoon in the evening (with the formula) "Together with the gods coming in the evering" and in the morning (with) "Together with the gods coming in the morning".[12] "Thee, the golden one, made of gold, (I rub)".[13] "Thou hast a golden handle and an immortal bowl".[13] "Thou art the channel for conveying the oblation".[13] It (thereby) becomes the channel for conveying the oblations. Then he says: "I shall ladle out".[14] He should speak: "Yes, I (shall send) myself to heaven".[15]

40. The first ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices by him who, knowing thus, lifts out the first ladle.

The second ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the Four-monthly sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the Four-monthly sacrifices by him who knowing thus lifts out the second ladle.

The third ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the *iṣṭis* and *paśubandhas*. There is sacrificed with the *iṣṭis* and the *paśubandhas* by him who knowing thus lifts out the third ladle.

The fourth ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the *tryambaka*, the *vājapeya* and the *aśvamedha* sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the *tryambaka*, the *vājapeya* and the *aśvamedha* sacrifices by him who knowing thus lifts out the fourth ladle.

Having taken a kindling-stick he goes eastward (to the āhavanīya). He puts (the *samidh* and the *sruc*) upon (the grass behind the āhavanīya) silently (reciting) "The kindling-stick is indeed a man. He is kindled by food (i.e. the oblation?). Make me go to heaven by the energy of the good. Where the dear embodiment of the gods and seers is, make my agnihotra go there".[16] Then he lays the *samidh* on (the āhavanīya reciting) "I make thee a bridge to heaven, a golden gangway, *svāhā*".[17] Then he offers. With the first (oblation) which

he offers he reaches the gods. And with the second which he offers he reaches the seers.

41. Then he wipes off (the ladle). When he wipes off the first time, he thereby propitiates the Gandharvas and the Apsaras.[18] To him the Gandharvas and Apsaras say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satisfied with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he wipes off the second time, he thereby propitiates the house[19] and the pitṛs.[20] To him the house and the pitṛs say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats twice (a small portion of what is left in the ladle) by means of his finger, when he eats the first time, thereby the *prāṇa* and the *apāna*[21] are satisfied. To him the *prāṇa* and the *apāna* say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats the second time, thereby the *udāna* and the *apāna* are satisfied. To him the *udāna* and the *apāna* say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats (the remaining contents of the ladle) by means of the ladle (i.e. by drinking the ladle out), he thereby propitiates the *samāna*, the *vyāna* and the embryos.[22] To him the *samāna*, the *vyāna* and the embryos say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he clears the ladle (i.e. when he licks it out) he thereby propitiates the divine hosts.[23] To him the divine hosts say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he pours out the cleansing-water of the ladle he thereby propitiates the birds.[24] To him the birds say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

The waters which he tosses upwards towards the north out of the ladle after he has washed it, thereby he propitiates the seers.[25] To him the seers say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he pours out the cleansing-water of the cauldron, he thereby propitiates the hosts of serpents.[26] To him the hosts of serpents say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he (the sacrificer) sits down to the south of the fires after he has circumambulated westward or eastward,[27] then he becomes Prajāpati and sits down (reciting the yajus:) "I am happiness *(kam)*, happiness is mine".[28]

NOTES

[1] The formulas *upasṛṣṭe dyāvāpṛthivī* and *rudrā upagṛhnanti vasūnāṃ dugdham* have no parallels. They can hardly be taken with *ity aṅgārān nirūhati*. This implies that here *iti* (in *ity āha*) as an exception precedes the quotation. Another solution to the problem would be taking *upasṛjāgnihotrīm* (emendation for *upasṛjyāgnihotrīm*) with the following *ity āha* and interpreting *upasṛṣṭe* .. etc. as a brāhmaṇa digression. There is, however, no parallel for *upasṛjāgnihotrīm* as a formula and moreover *rudrā upagṛhnanti* .. etc. looks like a verse rather than a brāhmaṇa digression.

[2] *bhūtakṛta stha nirūḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayam*. Cf. BhārŚS. 6, 10, 4; ĀpŚS. 6, 5, 6; HirŚS. 3, 7, 26 *bhūtakṛta(ḥ) sthāpoḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayam;* VaiŚS. 2, 2; 3, 6 *bhūtakṛtaḥ stha*. Mostly *bhūtakṛt-* is interpreted as "creative": "Die Schöpferischen seid ihr" (Caland, ĀpŚS. 6, 5, 6); "Vous êtes les créatrices" (Dumont, *L'Agnihotra*, p. 50); "You are the creators of beings" (Kashikar, transl. BhārŚS.). At the pushing back of the coals ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 10 and BhārŚS. 6, 10, 12 have *subhūtakṛtaḥ* ... "Die richtig Schöpferischen .." (Caland); "les bonnes créatrices .." (Dumont, o.c., p. 52); "the good creators of all beings" (Kashikar). Cf., however ŚŚS. 2, 8, 8 *subhūtakṛtaḥ subhūtaṃ naḥ kṛṇuta* (recited when the coals are pushed out of the fire) "Bienfaisantes, faites nous du bien" (Dumont, o.c., p. 188); "Ye welfare-bringing ones, bring us welfare" (Caland, transl. ŚŚS.). See also ŚŚS. 2, 8, 15 *subhūtāya vaḥ* (recited when the coals are pushed back) "Pour la prospérité, vous!" (Dumont, o.c., p. 189); "For welfare thou" (Caland, transl. ŚŚS.). In the context "welfare" *(subhūtam)* as a result of pushing away or back the *janyaṃ bhayam* is quite suitable. Even *bhūtam*, however, may have this meaning. So *bhūtakṛt-* does not (or at least not exclusively) refer to the creation of beings. That the welfare may consist of the fertility of the crops appears from HirŚS., which leaves us to choose between *nirūḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayaṃ saha tena yaṃ dviṣmaḥ subhūtāya śrayadhvam* (3, 7, 25) and *bhūtakṛtaḥ sthāpoḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayaṃ saha tena yaṃ dviṣma* (3, 7, 26) and between *pratyūḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayaṃ saha tena yaṃ dviṣmaḥ subhūtam akarta* and *bhūtakṛtaḥ sthāpyeti sasyaṃ yajamānasya* (3, 7, 38), not to be rendered with Dumont, o.c., p. 96 by "(..) Il entre (Agni entre?) dans la moisson du sacrifiant (?)", but by "(..) Crops fall to the share of the sacrificer". ĀśvŚS. 2, 2, 15 *suhutakṛtaḥ stha suhutaṃ kariṣyatha* (2, 3, 9 ... *akārṣta*), probably a secondary version, cannot originate in *su-bhūtakṛtaḥ*, but presupposes *subhūta-kṛtaḥ*. The formula *nirūḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayam*, occurring in this form only in JB. and HirŚS. 3, 7, 25 in the agnihotra ritual, is also used by Āp., Hir. and Bhār. for the Full-and New-Moon sacrifices.

[3] *vaiśvānarasyādhiśritam asi*. No parallels. For the ellipse with a genitive see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 9; for the ellipse of *agnau* with *adhiśri-* see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 19 a.

[4] *agnis te tejo mā pratidhākṣīt*. BŚS. 3, 5, 4 and VaiŚS. 2, 3 *(dhākṣīd)* apply this formula at the illuminating. Cf. ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 3 f. *avajvalayet* (..) *agniṣ ṭe tejo mā hārṣīr* (read *hārṣīd*) *iti*. JB. uses this verse for putting the pot

of milk on the coals. Compare *agnis te tejo mā vinait*, sometimes recited in the Full- and New-Moon ritual when the butter oblation is put on the fire.

[5] *saṃ jyotiṣā jyotiḥ* (VS. 2, 9; TS. 1, 1, 12, 1) is nowhere used in this connection.

[6] *yas te apsu rasaḥ praviṣṭas tena saṃpṛcyasva*. No parallels. Bloomfield's *Concordance* incorrectly reads *apsarasaḥ*.

[7] I.e. he fills up with water that quantity of the milk which has boiled away.

[8] *antaritaṃ rakṣo 'ntaritā arātayaḥ* (TS. 1, 1, 8, 1; VSK. 1, 8, 3) should obviously be taken with *triḥ paryagni karoti* and the daṇḍa be put before *antaritam* instead of before *triḥ*. This formula is found in seven YV. sūtras and ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 7. It occurs also in the ritual of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices.

[9] The formulas *divaṃ dṛṃha, antarikṣaṃ dṛṃha* and *pṛthivīṃ dṛṃha* are frequently found in other texts, but not in this connection. Cf., however, ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 7, where the kettle is taken from the fire in three stages with *dive tvā, antarikṣāya tvā* and *pṛthivyai tvā*. For *prajāṃ paśūn juhvato me dṛṃha* see ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 10; VaiŚS. 2, 3 *iha prajāṃ paśūn dṛṃha*. Cf. also BhārŚS. 6, 10, 10; ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 8 *ihorjaṃ dṛṃha*; HirŚS. 3, 7, 36 *ihorjaṃ yaccha*; 3, 7, 37 *prajāṃ me yaccha*.

[10] *bhūtakṛta stha pratyūḍhaṃ janyaṃ bhayam*. See n. 2.

[11] *pratyuṣṭaṃ rakṣaḥ pratyuṣṭā arātayaḥ*. This formula (VS. 1, 7, 29; TS. 1, 1, 2, 1) occurs in most sūtras. It similarly accompanies the heating of the utensils over the āhavanīya in the ritual of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices.

[12] *sajūr devebhyas sāyaṃyāvabhyaḥ/prātaryāvabhyaḥ*. Cf. ŚŚS. 2, 8, 21. The Taittirīya sūtras, TB. 2, 1, 5, 10 and VārŚS. 1, 5, 2, 27 read *sajūr devais sāyaṃyāvabhiḥ/prātaryāvabhiḥ*. All the parallels prescribe this formula for the touching of the *sthālī* and the *agnihotrahavaṇī* after the milk has been ladled out, whereas JB. is alone in connecting it with the rubbing of the *sruc* before the ladling out.

[13] *suvarṇāṃ tvāṃ suvarṇamayīm. hiraṇyayaṣṭir asy amṛtapalāśā sroto yajñānām*. HirŚS. 3, 7, 41 reads *suparṇāṃ tvā suparṇamayīm* .. ĀpŚS. 6, 7, 1 does not have the first formula, whereas VaiŚS. 2, 3 only quotes the pratīka *suparṇāṃ tvā* ... The sūtras agree with JB. in the application of the formula (before ladling out).

[14] *unneṣyāmi* is preceded by *oṃ* in most sūtras.

[15] *oṃ mām ahaṃ svargaṃ lokam abhi*. No parallels.

[16] *puruṣa it samit. tam annam inddhe annasya mā tejasā svargaṃ lokaṃ gamaya. yatra devānām ṛṣīṇāṃ priyaṃ dhāma tatra ma idam agnihotraṃ gamaya iti. tuṣṇīm upasādayati*. There are no parallels for the formulas *annasya mā* .. and *yatra devānām* .. For the latter compare, however, ĀpŚS. 6, 8, 11 *saptarṣīṇāṃ yatra lokas tatremaṃ yajñaṃ yajamānaṃ ca dhehy* (..) *ity apareṇāhavanīyaṃ darbheṣu sādayati*. No sūtra prescribes a silent putting down of the milk; some do not mention a formula. The agreement with ĀpŚS. 6, 8, 11, however, cannot but make us connect at least *yatra devānām* .. with *tūṣṇīm upasādayati*. Probably *annasya mā* .. should be taken together with *yatra devānām* .. and both formulas are used in addressing the *samidh* which is put down together with the milk. The eleven syllables *puruṣa it samit tam annam inddhe* may belong to the silent recitation (otherwise the critical edition). The *samidh* is a man who is able to make the agnihotra go to heaven.

[17] *svargasya tvā lokasya saṃkramaṇaṃ hiraṇmayaṃ vaṃśaṃ dadhāmi svāhā*. Cf. ĀpŚS. 6, 9, 4; HirŚS. 3, 7, 61 *hiraṇyayaṃ tvā vaṃśaṃ svargasya lo-*

kasya saṃkramaṇaṃ dadhāmi. Āpastamba explicitly states that this formula should be used in case a second *samidh* is put on the fire, whereas here only one is mentioned. The *vaṃśa* here is not an ordinary crossbeam (Caland, ĀpŚS. 6, 9, 4 "Querbalke"), it is a special plank or beam used for passing over gaps. Cf. ŚāṅkhB. 11, 4; GB. 2, 3, 11 *tad yathā matyena vā vaṃśena vā gartaṃ saṃkramed* .. Probably a *vaṃśanartin* (TB. 3, 4, 17, 1) is some sort of rope-dancer who performs acrobatic stunts while walking over a beam connecting two points high in the air *(antarikṣāya vaṃśanartinam)*.

[18] No parallels.

[19] Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 61 adopts the reading *gṛhāṃś ca*, whereas Raghu Vira reads *grahāṃś ca* with most mss. Vedic *graha-* "draught, spoonful" is not appropriate here and it is doubtful if the meaning "planet" already occurs in the brāhmaṇas (Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 26, p. 432, n. 2). Even if *grahāḥ* could denote a certain class of demons in these texts, the association with the pitṛs would be odd. So *gṛhāṃś ca* (and in the next sentence *gṛhāś ca*) should be read. For the plural of *gṛha-* standing for the singular see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 578 a; II, § 156 a. The house is propitiated BhārŚS. 6, 14, 3; ĀpŚS. 6, 12, 4; HirŚS. 3, 7, 102; VaiŚS. 2, 6, where the formula *gṛhebhyas tvā gṛhān jinva* (Hir. *prīṇīhi*) is recited when water is poured into the hands of the sacrificer's wife.

[20] Most parallels connect this second wiping off with the pitṛs. The verb *upamṛj-* denotes the cleansing of the ladle. In other texts *nimṛj-* is sometimes found. This refers to the wiping of the finger on the earth or on the grasses. In the second wiping off the hand is placed on the earth and the smearings are removed to the south according to the sūtras (see also e.g. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2), i.e. the region of the pitṛs.

[21] Cf. GB. 1, 3, 12 *yat prathamaṃ prāśiṣaṃ prāṇāṃs tenāpraiṣam;* VaitS. 7, 21 f. *sruksesaṃ prāśnāti prāṇān prīṇāmīti*.

[22] Cf. ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 5; HirŚS. 3, 7, 93 f. *garbhebhyas tvā garbhān prīṇīhi;* VārŚS. 1, 5, 2, 45 *garbhān prīṇāti garbhebhyaḥ svāheti*. BhārŚS. 6, 13, 6 applies the formula *garbhebhyas tvā garbhān jinva* at the second eating with the finger (cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 *yad dviḥ pradeśinyā prāśnāti garbhān pūrveṇa prīṇāti*). See further VaitS. 7, 21 f. *sruksesaṃ prāśnāti ... garbhān* (sc. *prīṇāmi*) *iti dvitīyam;* GB. 1, 3, 12 *yad dvitīyaṃ* (sc. *prāśiṣaṃ*) *garbhāṃs tena* (sc. *apraiṣam*); TB. 2, 1, 4, 7 *yat prāśnāti tad garbhāṇām*.

[23] The *devajanāḥ*, who are sometimes hosts of demons or snakes (see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 330), here perhaps are equivalent to the Viśve Devas (cf. Gonda, o.c., p. 308 quoting Renou, *E.V.P.* 8, p. 103: "les *devajana-* .. semblent résumer Āditya's et Rudra's ou équivaloir à Viśve Devāḥ"). The Viśve Devas, often placed in final position in enumerations and classifications, sometimes denote the totality of what has been enumerated, but they may also refer to that indefinite group of gods which is included for the sake of completeness or for fear of omitting a god. See in this connection GB. 1, 3, 12 *yad antataḥ sarvam eva prāśiṣaṃ viśvān devāṃs tenāpraiṣam;* VaitS. 7, 21 f. *viśvān devān* (sc. *prīṇāmi*) *ity antataḥ sarvam* (sc. *prāśnāti*). Perhaps the *devajanāḥ* refer to that same group of gods, this "rest of the gods", these "other gods". It is striking that MŚS. 1, 6, 1, 47 has in the same context as here *itarajanebhyaḥ svāheti nirleḍhi*. The *itarajanāḥ* seem to be spirits of darkness and the term may be euphemistic (Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 331), but it is remarkable that here this group is associated with the licking out of the remainder of the milk. See also VādhS. 4, 8 (*A.O.* 6, p. 105 f.) referring to *anyajanāḥ* (comparable to the *itarajanāḥ*) who receive the remains of the sacrificial victim ("Da fanden sie sie ab mit dem Inhalt des Magens und der

Gedärme und mit dem Blute", transl. Caland). Apparently these groups of *janāḥ* also have some demoniac aspects. See also ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 (dealing with the licking out and removing of the residue) *yat srucaṃ nirleḍhi sarpadevajanāṃs tena prīṇāti yat srucaṃ mārjayate rakṣodevajanāṃs tena prīṇāti*. Keith may be right in taking here *sarpadevajanāḥ* and *rakṣodevajanāḥ* as appositive and not as dvandva compounds, but in JB. at least *sarpajanāḥ* and *devajanāḥ* definitely form two different categories. Eggeling translates ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 7 *sarpadevajanāḥ* by "snake-deities", but compare the compound *sarpetarajanāḥ* (GB. 1, 3, 12) presumably to be analysed as *sarpa-* and *itarajanāḥ*. Caland's "die anderen Wesen als die Schlangen" (ĀpŚS. 6, 12, 4) is not convincing. That these *devajanāḥ* and *itarajanāḥ* who receive the *ucchiṣṭa* are not primarily demons ("Abfindung"!), but by receiving the remains make the sacrifice complete appears from ĀśvŚS. 2, 4, 13, where in a context without demons the *itarajanāḥ* obtain the last water libation after the seasons (the totality of time), the quarters (the totality of space) and the seven seers.

It should be observed that this licking out of the ladle is not found in the Saṃhitās, TB., Baudh. and Bhār., but occurs in ŚāṅkhB., ŚŚS., MŚS., KŚS., ĀpŚS. and HirŚS. So it may represent a later development. The older sources are simpler.

[24] No parallels. For a different propitiation of the birds (which are ominous just as the ants which are likewise propitiated according to some texts) see ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 *yad dviḥ pradeśinyā prāśnāti .. vayāṃsy uttareṇa* (sc. *prīṇāti*).

[25] Most sūtras mention this propitiation of the seven seers in this connection (with some variations). See also TB. 2, 1, 4, 8.

[26] Cf. VārŚS. 1, 5, 2, 50 *antarvedi prakṣalanaṃ ninayati sarpadevajanebhyaḥ svāheti*. Some other texts honour the snakes by pouring water out of the *sruc* (and not out of the *sthālī*).

[27] Cf. KŚS. 4, 13, 12 *apradakṣiṇam āhavanīyaṃ parītya* (in the evening); 4, 15, 2 *pradakṣiṇaṃ gārhapatyaṃ parītya* (at dawn). The sacrificer performs this action at the beginning of the agnihotra ritual.

[28] See JŚS. 22 (ed. D. Gaastra, thesis Utrecht 1906 = JŚS. 23: 28, 12 ff. ed. Premnidhi Shastri, *Jaiminīya-Śrauta-sūtra-vṛtti of Bhāvatrāta*, Śatapiṭaka series 40, New Delhi 1966) *sadāgnihotre goṣūktāśvasūkte geye* (ed. Gaastra: *gayet*). *sāyaṃ goṣūktaṃ prātar āśvasūktaṃ iti. pūrvasyām āhutau hutāyām. kam aham asmi kaṃ mamety etad uktvā vā*. JB. proves that the sacrificer sings the sāmans either after he has offered the first oblation (in case he performs the agnihotra himself) or after he has taken his seat south of the āhavanīya and has recited the formula *kam aham asmi kaṃ mama* (in case an officiant performs the sacrifice for him). So the interpretation of *Śrautakośa, English Section* 1, p. 144, which implies that the formula *kam aham ..* should be recited after the first oblation has been offered, is not correct. Miss Gaastra's supposition o.c., p. 33, n. 14 is confirmed. Here *kam* meaning "auspiciousness, wellfare (?)" is connected with *ka* "Prajāpati".

42–44. *The story of Bhṛgu*

This section was edited and translated by A. C. Burnell under the title *A Legend from the Talavakāra or Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*, Mangalore 1878. It was reprinted in *Atti del IV Congresso Intern. d. Orientalisti*, II (Florence 1881), p. 97 ff. and (with some omissions) in the *Indian Antiquary* 13 (1884), p. 16 ff. After this first published communication from the brāhmaṇa Oertel's edition and translation *J.A.O.S.* 15 (1892), p. 233 ff. was a considerable improvement. The parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 1 ff. was discussed (and translated) by Weber, *Z.D.M.G.* 9 (1855), p. 237 ff. [= *Indische Streifen* I (Berlin 1868),p. 24 ff.]. Eggeling's translation *S.B.E.* 44 (Oxford 1900), p. 108 ff. ignores the parallel from JB. Without adding much to its interpretation L. Scherman, *Materialien zur Geschichte der Indischen Visionslitteratur* (Leipzig 1892), p. 5-8 refers to this passage. Translations of one of the two versions are further found in S. Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les brāhmaṇas* (Paris 1966[2]; 1898[1]), p. 100 ff.; Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928[2]), p. 78 ff.; H. Lommel, *Altbrahmanische Legenden* (Stuttgart 1964), p. 36 ff. (with note on p. 73 f.) and J. Varenne, *Mythes et légendes extraits des Brāhmaṇa* (Paris 1967), p. 135 ff. For an ample discussion of the meaning of this passage (in both versions) with many ethnological parallels see Lommel, *Paideuma* 4 (1950), p. 93 ff. (see also o.c. 5, p. 201 ff.).

The contents of this story are that Bhṛgu being too proud of his theoretical knowledge is taught a lesson by his father Varuṇa, who makes him see some horrible visions in yonder world. People cut other people into pieces, eat other people etc. as they have been cut or eaten (as trees or plants) by human beings on earth. Performing the agnihotra with the correct knowledge of its implications wards off this cruel fate. So Bhṛgu concludes his study and establishes his fires in order to sacrifice with the agnihotra.

According to Weber this story represents "die priesterliche Aneignung eines volksthümlichen Stoffes (..) Dass die Schilderung dieser Vergeltung nun wirklich eine rein volksthümliche, eine dem Munde des Volkes entlehnte sei, ergiebt sich hier sogar noch aus sprachlichen Gründen" (o.c., p. 241). Indeed this episode may contain "reflections of the popular belief of the time as to the punishments awaiting the guilty in a future existence" (Eggeling, o.c., p. 108, n. 3 summarizing Weber's views). The linguistic arguments (i.a. *ti* instead of *iti*; *vibhajamānān* used as a passive) are, however, doubtful and moreover cannot be applied in the version of JB. (which on the basis of that criterion should be a younger version). See e.g. Minard's remarks (*Trois Énigmes* II, § 760) on the particle *ed*: ".. son allure solennelle (..; fautif Egg. II xxix 'a popular expression') qui s'accorde bien avec la couleur légendaire du livre XI, où il abonde (.., Bhṛgu aux Enfers)". One should look at the contents rather than at the wording (which may be important for the comparative chronology of the two versions).

Weber, o.c., p. 242 observes that Varuṇa's important position in this legend proves it to be "eine sehr alterthümliche". It has been connected with Parsism (see Scherman, o.c., p. 8, n. 3). Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 96 assumes a reference to the theory of rebirth in this description of yonder world, crowded with animals, trees, plants etc. in human shape: "Die in unserer Legende gebotene Anschauung von der jenseitigen Wiedergeburt der Lebewesen in verschiedenen Gestalten kann gar nicht isoliert für sich bestehen ohne die Anschauung von einer Wiedergeburt im Diesseits". I doubt, however, if one can assume that because of this rebirth in heaven or hell a parallel rebirth on earth was necessary. The description of yonder world is purely symbolical. Nobody is reborn on earth as water. Faith, Wrath etc. are just personifications in this story. It may be true that some fundamental conceptions "in die theologische Belehrung eingebaut sind" (o.c., p. 98), but as far as I am able to see one can only infer from this passage and the Indian parallels on "being eaten in return" that "animated" beings such as animals, plants etc. cannot be deprived of their "life" without consequences. The injuries inflicted on them are "revenged" in yonder world where all is the opposite of the situation in this world. Lommel, o.c., p. 101 ff. adduces interesting parallels from other cultures which prove that the motif of the reversal in the world of the dead (right is left etc.; even *agens* and *patiens* are reversed) is current in every folklore. This should warn us not to assume on weak grounds a typical Indian rebirth doctrine in this passage, which does not represent "eine von der andern Seite her gesehene Wiedergeburtslehre" (o.c., p. 97), but a description of life from the point of view of a completely reversed position in yonder world.

On being eaten in return, one of the motifs in this episode, see n. 16. One should take special note of ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1, where it is stated that food eats the eater in yonder world, i.e. the reversal is central, not the fact that the food consists of animals or plants which are reborn human beings. The automatism of this reversal in the world of the dead and its all-inclusiveness imply that being eaten in return and the other atrocities of this passage do not represent a moral retribution — Weber gave his paper the title "Eine Legende des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa über die strafende Vergeltung nach dem Tode" — as Lommel, o.c., p. 99 (see also *Paideuma* 5, p. 200 ff.) rightly observes. The fact that Bhṛgu asks if there are any *prāyaścittis* (ŚB.) or *niṣkṛtis* (JB.) for averting these evils, may be a indication that this passage does not deal with moral transgressions (Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 99 f.). This section does not advocate abstention from eating meat. In so far as the Vedic Indians do not repent of it, killing animals is not to be considered a sin (in our sense of the word). In their eyes the only evil is the result of the deed with relation to themselves. Since, however, all sorts of evil (produced by mistakes as well as by moral faults and sins) can be averted by means of a prāyaścitti (e.g. by performing the agnihotra knowing its implications), one may ask if Lommel's criticism (*Paideuma* 5, p. 202) of Keith, who speaks of "a passage on moral retribution" (*Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 409, n. XI 3[1]), is fair in every respect. For Vedic Indians sin may also include that evil

which is done inadvertently or which cannot be avoided in daily life. The morality of popular belief and the ritualists on the one side and of European "Moraltheologen" on the other side are often not in agreement.

Another point which has engaged the attention of scholars is the relation between the two versions. Burnell, who regards the version of ŚB. as "decidedly of a later time", advances no conclusive arguments for his view. Some vague remarks on the style of the two versions are not sufficient. Most of the authors mentioned in this introduction do not express an opinion on this subject. Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 28 is under the impression that the JB. version has a better composition and is more original because the visit from the earth to yonder world would be more suitable for seeing the atrocities than the visit to the quarters of the universe (in ŚB.). On this doubtful point see n. 2. Lévi, o.c., p. 100 f., n. 3 mentions all the differences and concludes: "Les deux recensions sont donc bien indépendantes". That the two recensions in spite of many points of difference have much in common may appear from the following outline:

	scene	*explanation*	*expiation*
ŚB. (1)	men dismembering men hewing off *(saṃvraścam)* limbs	trees	*samidh*
JB. (1)	man cutting *(saṃvṛścya)* man into pieces and devouring him	trees	*samidh*
ŚB. (2)	men dismembering men cutting up limbs	cattle	milk
JB. (2)	man devouring crying man	cattle	first oblation *vācā*
ŚB. (3)	silent men devouring silent men	herbs	illumination with burning straw
JB. (3)	man devouring silent man	rice and barley	second oblation *manasā*
ŚB. (4)	crying men devouring crying men	waters	water poured to the milk
JB. (4)	two women	faith and non-faith	eating twice with finger
ŚB. (5a)	two women	faith and non-faith	two oblations
JB. (5a)	black naked man	wrath	eating with spoon
ŚB. (5b)	black man	wrath	pouring out water

Conclusions:

a) Five topics of the scenes are identical (though differently worked out). Only ŚB. (2) has no parallel.
b) The parallelism of the scenes can be restored by replacing ŚB. (2) by ŚB. (4).

c) Both texts have five explanations in common (if one puts "herbs" on a line with "rice and barley"). Only ŚB. (4) "waters", which does not look very acceptable, has no parallel.
d) Leaving out this explanation "waters" and connecting its corresponding scene (4) on its right place (2) with the correct second explanation "cattle" one obtains a complete parallel.
e) In the expiations, which have only *samidh* in common, ŚB. has used for the first four scenes (which form a unity and refer to the reversed situation in yonder world) the ingredients of the agnihotra ritual. The explanation ŚB. (4) "waters" may have been brought about by the expiation "water poured to the milk".

All these facts need not imply that ŚB. has borrowed the Bhṛgu passage from JB. It is true that especially after the first four scenes the ŚB. passage looks ike an abridged version (*śraddhā, aśraddhā* and *krodha-* are hardly understandable in the context), but the composition of the story seems to be too independent from JB. to be a direct borrowing. Some points, some topics and some expressions are identical. A common source seems likely. The JB. version with its elaborate description of Varuṇa's world may be younger than its ŚB. parallel. The literal correspondence of *sa ha tatāma* etc. (see n. 3) with JB. 2, 160 and the fact that the theme of the father showing his own world to his son is also found at 2, 160 may be an indication that the Bhṛgu passage was adapted by JB. in its (probably) younger agnihotra section.

Finally it is to be observed that JB. very aptly builds in this Bhṛgu story in the context of this agnihotra section. It follows the propitiation of all sorts of powers by means of the agnihotra.

42. Bhṛgu, the son of Varuṇa,[1] was devoted to learning. He deemed himself superior to his father, to the gods and to the other brahmins who were devoted to learning.[2] Varuṇa considered: "My son knows nothing at all. Come, let me make him have a clear insight". He took his lifebreaths away. He fainted.[3] Having fainted he passed from this world. He arrived in yonder world.[4] A man cut an (other) man into pieces and then[5] devoured him. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?"[6] They[7] said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a second time.[8] A man devoured an (other) man who was crying out. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a third time. A man devoured an (other) man who was inaudibly uttering sounds.[9] He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a fourth time. Two women guarded a large property. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a fifth time. (Of) two streams flowing side by side, one filled with blood and the other with ghee,[10] a black naked man with a club guarded the stream filled with blood, and the stream filled with ghee, out of that golden men drew up[11] all things one may desire with golden cups. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a sixth time. Five rivers with blue and white lotuses, flowing with honey as water,[12] in these there was dancing and singing, the sound of lutes, crowds of Apsaras, a fragrant smell and a great noise. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

43. He returned from there. He came to Varuṇa. He (Varuṇa) said to him: "Did you arrive (there),[13] my son?" "I have arrived (there), father". "You have seen (it), my son?" "I have seen (it), father". "What, my son?"[14] "A man cut an (other) man into pieces and then devoured him". "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer[15] the agnihotra without knowing thus and cut trees and lay them on the fire, those the trees, having taken human form, eat in their turn[16] in yonder world". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he lays here (i.e. in the agnihotra ritual) a log of wood on the fire, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What (did you see) the second time?"[17] "A man devoured an (other) man who was crying out". "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and cook for themselves animals which cry out, those the animals, having taken human form, eat in their turn in yonder world". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he offers here the first oblation with speech (i.e. reciting the formula aloud), that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What the third time?" "A man devoured an (other) man who was inaudibly uttering sounds".[18] "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and cook themselves rice and barley, which inaudibly utter sounds, those rice and barley, having taken human form, eat in their turn in yonder world". "What

is the expiation for this?" "That he offers here the second oblation (reciting the formula) in thought, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What the fourth time?" "Two women guarded[19] a large property". "Yes", he said; "they were Faith and Non-Faith. If[20] any in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and sacrifice without faith, then it (i.e. that sacrifice) goes to Non-Faith; if (they sacrifice) with faith, it (goes) to Faith". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he eats here twice[21] with his finger, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

44. "What the fifth time?" "(Of) two streams flowing side by side, one filled with blood and the other with ghee, a black naked man with a club guarded[22] the stream filled with blood, and the stream filled with ghee, out of that (stream) golden men drew up all things one may desire with golden cups". "Yes", he said; "if[23] any in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and shed (literally: press out) the blood of a brahmin, then it (i.e. that blood) becomes that stream filled with blood; and the black naked man[24] with a club who guarded it, he is Wrath. That (blood) indeed is his food". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he eats here with the ladle (i.e. drinks the milk out of the ladle), that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided. And the water that he tosses upwards to the north after having washed the spoon, that is the stream filled with ghee.[25] Out of that (stream) golden[26] men draw up all things one may desire with golden cups".

"What the sixth time?" "Five rivers with blue and white lotuses, flowing with honey as water, in these there was dancing and singing, the sound of lutes, crowds of Apsaras, a fragrant smell and a great noise". "Yes", he said; "these, forsooth, were my worlds". "By what are they to be won?" "By fivefoldly taking[27] this (milk out of the cauldron) and lifting[27] (it) out (into the *sruc*)". He (Bhṛgu) said: "There is indeed nowhere outside the agnihotra an opportunity for the conquest of a world (in heaven). (So) today (will be) my fast-day preceding the setting up of the sacred fires".[28] Thus they arranged it for him. He who knowing thus offers the agnihotra, him do not eat in their turn the trees having taken human form in yonder world, nor the animals, nor rice and barley, nor do his meritorious works and his sacrifices[29] go to Faith and Non-Faith. He wards off the stream filled with blood. He obtains the stream filled with ghee.

NOTES

[1] For Varuṇa's fatherfood see AB. 3, 34, 1. Cf., however, also MS. 4, 3, 9: 49. 4 ff.; PB. 18, 9, 1; JB. 2, 201. Bhṛgu asks his father TU. 3, 1 to teach him brahman.

[2] *anyān brāhmaṇān* may imply that Bhṛgu himself is to be considered a brahmin, unless *anya-* means ". . the gods and the others, to wit the brahmins". At any rate in the JB. version Bhṛgu is a mortal, who is sent by his father Varuṇa (the god?) from earth to the *paraloka-*, whereas ŚB. seems to place the conversation between father and son and Bhṛgu's visions in one and the same celestial (?) level. After his return from the (five) quarters of the universe Varuṇa asks his son why he does not study his lesson (ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 7). This would seem to indicate that Bhṛgu is an ordinary brahmacārin, but the human conditions may have been projected in a divine environment as is often the case in the brāhmaṇas. At first sight the instruction of Bhṛgu by Varuṇa at TU. 3, 1 seems to be imparted on earth, but the passage concludes with the remark that the insight that brahman is bliss represents the knowledge of Varuṇa's son Bhṛgu which has its foundation in heaven: *saiṣā bhārgavī vāruṇī vidyā parame vyoman pratiṣṭhitā*. If, indeed, Bhṛgu has to be situated in heaven, this may explain the otherwise unexplicable visits to the quarters of the universe in ŚB. If Varuṇa is in heaven when he sends his son to the quarters of the universe, then Caland's arguments ("Over en uit het JB.", p. 28) in favour of the originality of JB. (see the introd. of this section) are no longer valid. In that case one might even argue that the version of ŚB. shows us a more original and more divine Varuṇa and Bhṛgu. Bhṛgu's visit to the points of the compass is found in a quite different context at GB. 1, 1, 4, where he goes to the quarters after being created by Brahman. Even if this vague agreement is perhaps accidental, Bhṛgu's celestial position is once more illustrated. The purely human and terrestrial Bhṛgu of JB. may be comparatively young.

[3] Compare JB. 2, 160 describing with exactly the same words *(sa ha tatāma. sa ha tāntaḥ paraṃ lokaṃ jagāma. sa hāmuṣmin loke . .)* how the son of a sacrificer faints away and his "soul" goes to heaven (whereafter, meeting his deceased father there, he returns to earth). See E. Arbmann, "Tod und Unsterblichkeit im vedischen Glauben", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 25 (1927), p. 357: "Bewusstlosigkeit ist die zeitweilige, Tod die dauernde und unwiderrufliche Trennung des Menschen vom Körper". For taking someone's breath of life see JB. 3, 168 f.; PB. 17, 12, 2.

[4] The expression *paraṃ lokaṃ jagāma* simply means "he passed away from this world", whereas *amuṣmin loka ājagāma* depicts the arrival in yonder world. That *asau loka* may be favourable as well as unfavourable becomes clear when one compares this passage with JB. 2, 160. Both *para-* and *asau loka-* refer to an indefinite yonder world in which the *svargaloka* may be included, but more often is excluded. Cf. M. A. Boyer, *J. As.* 1901, p. 486 f.; Gonda, *Loka*, p. 84 ff.

[5] For *atha* after the gerund see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 166 ff.

[6] Geldner translates *abhūd batedaṃ kiṃ svid idam* by "Ei, das war! Was war denn das?" Because of the initial position of *abhūd*, however, one should assume two questions (as is done by Oertel, o.c., p. 234 and Lévi, o.c., p. 101). Cf. Gonda, *Remarques sur la place du verbe dans la phrase active et moyenne en langue sanscrite* (Utrecht 1952), p. 14 f. ("Le verbe se trouve dans la position initiale dans une interrogation qui n'est pas introduite par une particle interrogative ou par un pronom").

[7] The plural may indicate that the JB. version, in which a single man (and not as in ŚB. a group of men) performs the atrocities (and answers the question), is not the original and has carelessly borrowed from its source (either ŚB. or a common source).

[8] *dvitīyaṃ hājagāma*. Oertel, o.c., p. 234: "He came to a second". What should be supplied after "second"? Lommel remarks o.c., p. 94: "In Anlehnung an das Śatapatha-Brahmana könnte man dazu jedesmal das Femininum *diś* "Himmelsgegend" ergänzen, und denken, dass da nach den 4 Hauptrichtungen noch 2 Zwischengegenden gemeint seien. Dann wäre die Jenseitsvorstellung in örtlichen Hinsicht wie im Śatapatha-Brahmana". How should *dvitīyam*, however, refer to a feminine noun? Moreover *ājagāma* is construed with the locative *(amuṣmin loke)* in the first paragraph. So it is improbable that *dvitīyam* would refer to a second yonder world, apart from the fact that, though there are many lokas (see Gonda, *Loka*, s.v. "plurality of lokas"), the expression *asau loka* occurs only in the singular. In this one yonder world Bhṛgu arrives six times and every time meets with a different, particular loka, in accordance with the casuistic division of the merits and demerits. So *dvitīyam, tṛtīyam* etc. have to be taken adverbially with Lévi, o.c., p. 101 "en second lieu, en troisième lieu .. etc.". That this is correct, proves JB. 1, 43 *kiṃ dvitīyam* (sc. *adarśas*) "What (did you see) secondly?"

[9] On the reading of one of Oertel's mss. *tūṣṇīṃ vyāharantam* which I have adopted see n. 18.

[10] *lohitakulyāṃ ca ghṛtakulyāṃ ca prabāhuḥ syandamāne* is construed with *ājagāma* by Geldner, o.c., p. 78, who takes it as a second accusative after *pañcamam*. Oertel, o.c., p. 235 seems to interpret the participle as equivalent to a finite verb form, but does not account for the accusative. These words should, however, be taken with the following sentence as a disjunct accusative. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 78 "The proleptic accusative consists of a noun accompanied by a participle". The two accusatives are not wholly absolute as one of them depends on *jugopa*. The anacoluthon of this sentence is caused by *udacire*, which is not construed with an accusative.

[11] Read with Hoffmann, *K.Z.* 79, p. 172, n. 2 ("Die schlechte Überlieferung des JB. erlaubt ohne weiteres diese Korrektur von Hs. *udacire*") *udācire*.

[12] Oertel, o.c., p. 235 translates *pañca nadīḥ .. syandamānāḥ* "Five rivers .. (were) flowing", but rejects *(Syntax of Cases*, p. 19) the possibility "that, with the exception of the past participle in *-ta*, participles occur in the Brāhmaṇa prose in the clear rôle of finite verbs". So it is preferable to regard *pañca nadīḥ .. syandamānāḥ* as a pendent nominative which anticipates the locative *tāsu* (cf. Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 36).

[13] *āgās* (as Oertel correctly reads) probably does not refer to his coming back (Oertel, Lévi and Geldner) but to his arriving somewhere. Just as *adarśas* is a short expression to which as object "something" or "it" should be supplied, so *āgās* implies "somewhere" or "there". The conciseness may be colloquial or euphemistic ("there", i.e. "in those horrible places"; "it", i.e. "those atrocities after death").

[14] Read with Oertel, o.c., p. 235 *kiṃ tātā3 iti* and not *kiṃ tateti* (Raghu Vira). The son addresses his father with *tata*, the father his son with *tāta*.

[15] The reading *juhvato* of some mss. (instead of *ajuhvato*) may be correct. The point is not that people do not offer the agnihotra, a sacrifice which is accepted even by the most a-ritualistic circles, but that the knowledge of its implications is lacking with some people. The opposite of *agnihotraṃ juhvato naivaṃvidaḥ* is *sa ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti* (end of JB. 1, 44). If *ajuhvato* is read, the negation before *evaṃvidaḥ* either is superfluous and irreg-

ular, or it separates *evaṃvidaḥ* from *juhvato*, as appears from Oertel's, Lévi's and Geldner's translations. *evaṃvid agnihotraṃ juhoti* forms, however, one expression.

[16] On this being eaten in return see ŚāṅkhB. 11, 3 (see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 26, p. 196); JB. 1, 26 (see section 26-38, n. 1); 2, 182 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 178 f.) *tathā hainam amuṣmin loke paśavo nādanti. adanti ha vā amuṣmin loke paśavaḥ puruṣam;* ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1 *sa yad dha vā asmin loke puruṣo 'nnam atti tad enam amuṣmin loke pratyatti;* Manu 5, 55 *māṃ sa bhakṣayitāmutra yasya māṃsam ihādmy aham* and Ūrdhvāmnāya Saṃhitā 1, 10 (see Weber, o.c., p. 26, n. 2). Cf. also BhāgP. 5, 26, 11 (see Scherman, o.c., p. 6, n. 2). For this motif in the folklore outside India see Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 106 ff. and Oertel's paper "Altindische Parallelen zu abendländischen Erzählungsmotiven" in *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte* [Herausgegeben von Dr. Max Koch] VIII (1908), p. 120. The basic principle of this theme is the reversal of *agens* and *patiens* as part of the general, complete reversal in yonder world (see introduction).

The trees eat in return, because man has eaten them by means of the fire. So Lommel's remark "So wenig als Holzscheite Menschenspeise sind, so wenig können die Bäume hier Mensenfresser sein. Solche Abirrungen ergeben sich beim wiederholten Nacherzählen" (*Paideuma* 4, p. 97) is without foundation.

[17] *kiṃ dvitīyam* (sc. *adarśas*, to be supplied from *adarśas tātā*3 .. *kiṃ tātā*3). Cf. n. 8.

[18] Some mss. read *vyāharantam* and *vyāharataḥ* without the privative particle *a-*. In the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 10 the plants are identified with the *tūṣṇīm āsīnān* "still sitzende" (Weber, o.c., p. 25), "sitting still" (Eggeling). The *tertium comparationis* is, however, not the immobility of the plants, but (as appears from JB. and was rightly understood by Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 98) their silence in contrast with the crying ones, the animals. Varenne's translation "assis et silencieux" (o.c., p. 136) does not express the durative aspect of *ās-*, which in connection with *tūṣṇīm* does not only mean "to keep quiet, remain motionless", (cf. BhāgP. 8, 7, 4 *tūṣṇīṃ sthitān* "standing idly by; remaining inactive") but also "to remain silent". See Mayrhofer's *Concise Etym. Sanskrit Dict.* I, s.v. *tūṣṇīm* and compare JB. 2, 50 *yadā vai tūṣṇīm āste prāṇam eva vāg apyeti;* Pañcatantra 1, 2 *yāvac chākhāgrair vāyuvaśād dhanyate, tāvac chabdaṃ karoti, anyathā tūṣṇīm āste.* In the JB. version *tūṣṇīm* beside *avyāharantam* is pleonastic. Contrary to all translators and editors the forms without privative *a-* should be retained. The question is not so much that rice and barley, when harvested and cooked, do not cry, as that they cry inaudibly. Compare the use of *tūṣṇīm* in *tūṣṇīṃ śaṃsati*. The expiation *manasottarām āhutiṃ juhoti* also does not imply mere silence, but may refer to the silent recitation of a formula. The same insertion of a privative *a-* occurs in some mss. JB. 1, 18 *avidvāṃsam; ajānantam;* 1, 50 idem; 1, 43 f. *ajuhvataḥ*.

[19] Read with Oertel *ajūgupatām* instead of *ajugupatām*.

[20] *ye vā asmin loke 'gnihotram (a)juhvato naivaṃvido 'śraddadhānā yajante tad aśraddhāṃ gacchati yac chraddadhānās tac chraddhām.* Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 61 rightly takes this sentence as an instance of "The Anacoluthic Construction of Relative Clauses" and observes: "Note that the relative pronoun *ye* in the first half corresponds to the conjunction *yad* in the second". His translation "If any in this world, not offering the Agnihotra (and) not knowing thus, sacrifice without faith, — that (sacrifice of theirs) goes unto Non-Faith; if (they sacrifice) with faith that (Agnihotra goes) unto Faith", is, however, untenable. *agnihotram (a)juhvato naivaṃvido* must be taken with

aśraddadhānāḥ as well as with *śraddadhānāḥ*. It is hardly conceivable that *tad* first means "(sacrifice)" and later on "(Agnihotra)" in the same sentence. Oertel's "that (sacrifice of theirs)" cannot refer to the agnihotra since he retains the reading *agnihotram ajuhvato*. His rendering *J.A.O.S.* 15, p. 237 "(..) that (sacrifice) goeth unto Non-Faith; what (they sacrifice) with faith, that (goeth) unto Faith" is more satisfactory (though *yad* "if, when" seems to be preferable). Geldner, who retains the privative *a-* in the rest of this passage, drops it here: "Wenn sie nämlich in dieser Welt zwar das Agnihotra darbringen, aber ohne richtige Erkenntnis und ohne Glauben opfern, so gelangt es zum Unglauben. Wenn aber einer im Glauben, so gelangt es zum Glauben" (o.c., p. 79). The constantly repeated, stereotyped turn of phrase *ye vā asmin loke 'gnihotram (a)juhvato naivaṃvidaḥ* should, however, consistently be read with or without *a-*. See n. 15. Moreover *naivaṃvidaḥ* should not be disjoined from the stock phrase and connected with *yajante*. Presumably *yajante* does not have any special relation to the agnihotra. It refers to sacrifices in general, such as the great soma sacrifices, where *śraddhā* plays a more important role and *yaj-* mostly is used (the agnihotra shows a preference for *hu-*). The meaning of *tad* here is "that (special sacrifice, i.e. the sacrifice of people who, not knowing the background of their agnihotra, sacrifice with or without faith)". Cf. ŚB. 3, 1, 1, 5 *ye brāhmaṇāḥ śuśruvāṃso 'nucānā vidvāṃso yajayanti saivāhvālā* "If learned, instructed, knowing Brāhmaṇas perform the sacrifice there is no failure" (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 60). Here *tad* is replaced by *sā* on account of the feminine predicate. One might also translate: "If learned (..) brahmins perform a sacrifice, that (sacrifice) is not a failure" or "the sacrifice of learned (..) brahmins is not a failure". Cf. also n. 23.

One may ask why reaching *śraddhā* is an evil for which a *niṣkṛti* has to be found. That is why Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 98 observes: "... auch hier ist die Allegorie nicht recht gelungen; denn die Frau "Unglauben" ist ja gleich "Glauben" als Schatzhüterin hingestellt". According to Weber, o.c., p. 29 the two women originally were not Faith and Non-Faith "wie die priesterliche Deutung des Brāhmaṇa sie erklärt", but the keepers of good and evil. Whatever their original function may have been, in this text they are Faith and Non-Faith and as such have to be explained. Moreover both are here regarded as unfavourable (even Faith or the keeper of good). The one sacrifice goes to Faith, the other to Non-Faith, but both seem to be deposited in the one *mahad vittam* which is watched by the two women. The result of *śraddhā* and *aśraddhā* in sacrifices apparently comes to the same thing and *śraddhā* is senseless, unless one knows the implications of the daily agnihotra. See also H. W. Köhler, *Śraddhā in der vedischen und alt-buddhistischen Literatur* (thesis Göttingen 1948), p. 66, n. 2: "Der Sinn scheint zu sein (..): Nicht dem Opferer selbst kommt der Lohn seiner Opfer und Werke zu gute, sondern im einen Fall der Aśr., im anderen der Śr., wenn er nicht (..) grundsätzlich das Agnihotra darbringt und im besonderen bestimmte Sühneriten dabei beachtet, die gelehrt werden".

[21] Read with Oertel *dvir aṅgulyā*.

[22] As Oertel, o.c., p. 237, n. 100 observes, the perfect *(jugopa)* is very irregular in quotations. In Bhṛgu's narration *jaghāsa, jugupatuḥ, āsa, jugopa, udācire* and *babhūva* are replaced by *aghad, ajūgupatām, abhūt, jugopa* (sic), *udacante* (sic) and *abhūt*.

[23] *ye (..) brāhmaṇasya lohitam utpīḍayanti sā sā lohitakulyā*. For this construction see n. 20. Here *sā* for syntactical reasons stands for *tad* and is repeated in order to express that every drop of blood which is shed enters

that river. For an alternative interpretation — *utpīḍayati* literally means "to press out" — see n. 24.

[24] The black man seems to be Yama (Scherman, o.c., p. 7), here named Krodha. This identification is confirmed by Scherman's quotation (p. 8) from Laghucāṇakya (III, 8), where *krodhaḥ* occurring together with *tṛṣṇā, vidyā* and *saṃtoṣaḥ* is equated with *vaivasvato devaḥ*. All shed blood feeds the wrath of the revenging god of death. It is, however, also conceivable that the blood-river represents the blood pressed out of the brāhmaṇa-injurers, who in their turn suffer the same treatment which they had imparted on earth. In that case Wrath would be the symbol of the retaliation of the injured brahmins. His *musala-* then might be interpreted as a pestle (a meaning more usual than "club") with which he presses out *(utpīḍayati)* the blood of the sinners.

[25] Observe that a really favourable vision does not need a *niṣkṛti*, whereas *śraddhā* guarding the large property had to be expiated and therefore cannot but be unfavourable in the context (see n. 20).

[26] Gold means immortality. The golden men are the immortal agnihotrins who reap the fruits of their ritual *sukṛta* (apparently not taken by Faith and Non-Faith) in yonder world.

[27] On the construction see Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite*, p. 537: "Le groupe verbal (en *ta-*) suivi de substantif apposé [in this case a noun denoting milk may be supplied] peut équivaloir à un abstrait suivi d'un génitif" [here: "this taking (of the milk)"].

[28] Bhṛgu now has discovered that more study is superfluous. This does not imply a rejection of wisdom and a preference for the ritual. As a student Bhṛgu had only learnt ritual details. Varuṇa now made it clear to him that knowing the important implications and background of the rather simple agnihotra ritual secures immortality. So Bhṛgu decides to set up his fires as soon as possible, i.e. the next day.

[29] For *iṣṭāpūrta-* see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 236 f.

45–46. (first half) and 49 (second half)–50. *The doctrine of the five fires. Eschatology*

JB. 1, 45 dealing with the *pañcāgnividyā* has a close parallel in ŚB. 14, 9, 1, 12 ff. (= BĀU. 6, 1, 9 ff.); BĀU. 6, 2, 9 ff. (Kāṇva rec.) and ChU. 5, 4, ff. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 134 ff. for a translation of the JB. passage and a comparative table of the four versions (for a table of three versions, without JB., see also Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 138). On the meaning of this *pañcāgnividyā* within the framework of a water doctrine see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI. Just as in the upaniṣadic parallels the *pañcāgnividyā* is followed by a description of the (twofold) path to heaven (1, 46). First some sort of *pitṛyāna* (of those who do not know the right answer on the question "Who art thou?") ending with the *ṛtus* (instead of the year which gives entrance to immortality) is sketched. This passage (the first half of 1, 46) is followed by an insertion on the ritual of death, with which will be dealt in the next section. The *devayāna* passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* .. starts as a sequel to the cremation as treated in the sūtra-like insertion (1, 49) and seems to be independent from the *pañcāgnividyā* passage. The two descriptions of the path to heaven, however, belong together, as appears from the last phrase of 1, 49 which is also found in 1, 46. JB. 1, 50 describes the correct reaction of the deceased on the question "Who art thou?". For a similar twofold reaction on this question (there asked by the sun itself) see JB. 1, 18. For this *devayāna* passage see the introduction of 17-18 (where further literature is given).

The following scheme may show the agreements and differences between the parallel versions of the *pañcāgnividyā*. It starts from the version of BĀU. (M.). The following signs are used. — means: identical; ≠ means: identical with minor variations such as *vṛṣṭiḥ* / *varṣam*; ≠≠ means: identical with variations such as *parjanyaḥ* / *stanayitnuḥ*.

	BĀU. (M.)	*BĀU. (K.)*	*ChU.*	*JB.*
Fire	1 *asau lokaḥ*	—	—	*ya eṣa tapati*
	2 *parjanyaḥ*	—	—	≠≠
	3 *ayaṃ lokaḥ*	—	*pṛthivī*	*pṛthivī*
	4 *puruṣaḥ*	—	—	—
	5 *yoṣā*	—	—	≠≠
Fuel	1 *ādityaḥ*	—	—	*rātriḥ*
	2 *saṃvatsaraḥ*	—	*vāyuḥ*	*dyauḥ*
	3 *pṛthivī*	—	*saṃvatsaraḥ*	*antarikṣam*
	4 *vyāttam*	—	*vāk*	*vāk*
	5 *upasthaḥ*	—	—	≠
Smoke	1 *raśmayaḥ*	—	—	—
	2 *abhrāṇi*	—	≠	—

	3 *vāyuḥ*	*agniḥ*	*ākāśaḥ*	—	
	4 *prāṇaḥ*	—	—	—	
	5 *lomāni*	—	*yad upa-mantrayate*	*iṣyāḥ*	
Flame	1 *ahaḥ*	—	—	—	
	2 *vidyut*	—	—	—	
	3 *rātriḥ*	—	—	*agniḥ*	
	4 *vāk*	—	*jihvā*	*cakṣuḥ*	
	5 *yoniḥ*	—	—	*yoniḥ*	
Coals	1 *candramāḥ*	*diśaḥ*	—	—	
	2 *aśaniḥ*	—	—	—	
	3 *diśaḥ*	*candramāḥ*	—	—	
	4 *cakṣuḥ*	—	—	*śrotram*	
	5 *yad antaḥ karoti*	—	—	*saṃsparśaḥ*	
Sparks	1 *nakṣatrāṇi*	*avāntaradiśaḥ*	—	—	
	2 *hrādunayaḥ*	—	—	≠	
	3 *avāntaradiśaḥ*	*nakṣatrāṇi*	—	*marīcayaḥ*	
	4 *śrotram*	—	—	*manas*	
	5 *abhinandāḥ*	—	—	≠	
Oblation	1 *śraddhā*	—	—	*amṛtam āpaḥ*	
	2 *somaḥ*	≠	≠	≠	
	3 *vṛṣṭiḥ*	—	≠	—	
	4 *annam*	—	—	—	
	5 *retaḥ*	—	—	—	
Result	*puruṣaḥ*	—	≠≠	—	

Conclusions:

a) The Mādhy. and the Kāṇv. rec. are almost identical. Coals and Sparks 1 have been interchanged with Coals and Sparks 3. Only Smoke 3 *(agniḥ)* is different.

b) ChU. agrees with the Vājasaneyins rather than with JB. Only in two cases in which it differs from BĀU. there is an agreement with JB. *(pṛthivī; vāk)*.

c) The Fire and Fuel series of BĀU. and JB. have a different starting-point. The fivefold classification consists of two parts: the tripartition heaven — intermediate space — earth and man and woman. The oblation is poured into the whole range of the three parts of the cosmos, whereas in the case of man and woman only a special part (mouth; vulva) receives the offering. Compare ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff., where the agnihotra oblations enter *antarikṣam, dyauḥ* and *iyam*, which are at the same time their āhavanīya. On entering *puruṣaḥ* and *strī* they make the *mukham* and *upasthaḥ* their āhavanīya. In the present passage ŚB. bases itself on *puruṣaḥ | vyāttam* and *yoṣā | upasthaḥ* and creates the couples *asau lokaḥ | ādityaḥ* and *ayaṃ lokaḥ | pṛthivī*, in which *asau* and *ayaṃ lokaḥ* represent the totality and *ādityaḥ* and *pṛthivī* the part. The second sacrifice with

parjanyaḥ and *saṃvatsaraḥ*, however, does not seem to fit in this structure. In JB. on the other hand the fuel in the first three sacrifices is not that special part of the fire on which the oblation is poured (compare the function of the *samidh* in the agnihotra ritual), but the wood which keeps the fire burning. The sun-fire is nourished by the darkness of the night, the thunder-fire by the atmosphere of heaven, the earth-fire by the atmosphere which covers the earth. The occurrence of *vāk* instead of *vyāttam* in the fourth sacrifice may be due to a tendency of the brāhmaṇas not to deviate from a fixed series — *vāk* is one of the five *prāṇāḥ* — even if inconsistencies arise in their classifications. Perhaps, however, these *prāṇāḥ* here do not denote the vital powers, but the orifices, and *vāk* refers to the mouth rather than to speech. In the two BĀU. recensions *vāk* (Flame 4) may, however, refer to speech, which sometimes is homologized with *agni*. ChU. seems to have borrowed *vāk* (Fuel 4) from JB. and to have replaced *vāk* (Flame 4) by *jihvā*, not one of the five *prāṇāḥ*, but chosen for its outward resemblance and also occurring (as *samidh*) in the five-fire doctrine ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff. Remarkably *pṛthivī* (Fire 3) in ChU. does not fit in the classification of the first three sacrifices, which for the rest agrees with ŚB. Again there may be influence from JB.

d) On account of Flame 3 *(rātriḥ)* the Kāṇva rec. has transposed *candramāḥ* and *nakṣatrāṇi* from the first to the third sacrifice.

e) Flame 3 *(rātriḥ)* is the counterpart of Flame 1 *(ahaḥ)* in BĀU. and ChU., just as *ayaṃ lokaḥ* of *asau lokaḥ* (BĀU.). The second sacrifice does not belong to this symmetric classification. JB., however, has a perfect triple division: *ahaḥ* "light produced by the sun", *vidyut* "light produced by thunder" and *agniḥ* "earthly light".

f) In the Kāṇva rec. Smoke 3 *(agniḥ)* is hardly tenable. Otherwise Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 138 assuming that "statt *vāyuḥ* mit Bṛh. *agniḥ* (Feuer in der Rolle des Rauches mochte anstössig befunden und daher verbessert werden), statt *saṃvatsaraḥ* mit Chand. *vāyuḥ* eingesetzt werden muss". Smoke 3 *(vāyuḥ)* is an excellent counterpart of Smoke 4 *(prāṇaḥ)*, whereas *agniḥ* is difficult to be explained as "smoke".

g) Against Deussen, o.c., p. 138 *saṃvatsaraḥ* should be retained as the original Fuel 2 of the upaniṣads (JB. differs in the Fire / Fuel series as was shown above). Since *vāyuḥ* evidently belongs to the third sacrifice, we are led to infer that *vāyuḥ* and *saṃvatsaraḥ* have been interchanged in ChU. In the second sacrifice *vāyuḥ* could easily replace *saṃvatsaraḥ* as fuel for *parjanyaḥ*, because wind, thunder and rain go together, whereas *saṃvatsaraḥ* as Fuel 3 could take the place of *pṛthivī* which had become vacant after the dropping of *ayaṃ lokaḥ*. For *vāyuḥ* Smoke 3 *ākāśaḥ* forms a worthy substitute.

h) JB. has *marīcayaḥ* (see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 97 a) as Sparks 3 instead of *avāntaradiśaḥ*. In the same third sacrifice *antarikṣam* and *vāyuḥ* are occurring. For this combination see the *pañcāgnividyā* of ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff.

One may conclude that the two BĀU. versions are more or less identical. ChU. agrees with BĀU. in many respects, but shows some traceable

changes which may be due in part to influence from JB., and that the version of JB. though agreeing in several points with BĀU. is (especially in the first three sacrifices) based on a different, perhaps more original classification.

Obviously the first oblation *amṛtam āpaḥ* (JB.) is more original than *śraddhā* (BĀU.; ChU.), as appears from the question *vettho yatithyām āhutyāṃ hutāyām āpaḥ puruṣavāco bhūtvā samutthāya vadanti* (BĀU. 6, 2, 2); *vettha yathā pañcamyām āhutāv āpaḥ puruṣavacaso bhavanti* (ChU. 5, 3, 3). The waters to which this question refers are the original first oblation, which being successively transformed into soma, rain, food and semen produce a human being with a human voice at the fifth offering. The riddle question of the upaniṣads presupposes the reading *āpaḥ* (with or without *amṛtam*, see n. 3) of the brāhmaṇa. Deussen, to whom the JB. parallel was unknown, considered (*The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, New York 1966², p. 334) *śraddhā* to be the immortal part of man which ascends to heaven from the funeral pyre and there is offered by the gods. "This immortal part is termed by Yājñavalkya *karman*, work, and in our passage is described after the analogy of the sacrificial fluid as "water", and later on as "faith". (..) They signify however essentially the same, inasmuch as the peculiar essence and so to speak the soul of the work *(karman)* that ascends as the sacrificial vapour *(āpas)* is the faith *(śraddhā)* with which it is offered". It is, however, not to be assumed that the first phase of an old water doctrine would be termed "waters" "after the analogy of the sacrificial fluid". Why should *śraddhā* especially be connected with the funeral "sacrifice" and therefore be equal to the *karman* of the dead even though this *śraddhā* rests, in fact, with the relatives who cremate him? The *āpaḥ* are the heavenly waters. Originally the water doctrine was not cyclic. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI. There are no clear indications that in JB. the *pañcāgnividyā* was connected with the transmigration theory. On the other hand it is remarkable that the *pañcāgnividyā* which is mostly regarded as forming a secondary combination with the doctrine of the *pitṛ-* and *devayāna* in the upaniṣads in this section is similarly connected with two paths.

One may ask why in JB. this section was included in 1, 1-65 which deals with the agnihotra, whereas the upaniṣadic parallels do not have any relation to that rite. The funeral rites of the context and the fact that this eschatology starts from the cremation, which is often connected with the agnihotra, may be one of the reasons. Perhaps, however, one has to start from the *pañcāgnividyā*, which in JB. is not explicitly brought into connection with the agnihotra, but obviously refers to a fivefold agnihotra at ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff.

The upaniṣadic passages in which the transmigration doctrine plays an important role are obviously later than JB. This brāhmaṇa, however, need not be the direct, only source of these texts. In the brāhmaṇa itself the relation between the several passages is rather difficult. In the introduction of the section 17-18 it has already been observed that the passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* seems to form an insertion in JB. 1, 17-18. On the other hand the one Ṛtu who asks the question *ko*

'si puruṣa (1, 49) does not seem to agree with the plural vocative *ṛtavo* in the verse and with the fact that Ṛtus, and not one Ṛtu, lead the deceased to immortality. Presumably the original situation was the following: a) the *devayāna* passage starting at 1, 49 as a sequel to the cremation; the deceased passes from smoke to night, to day, to the halves of the month, to the month and finally to the Ṛtus to whom he announces himself with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*; b) the deceased meets the sun and either gives the wrong answer to the question *kas tvam asi* and is seized by the Ṛtus, or correctly answers and is released (JB. 1, 18; JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1 ff.); c) the deceased, who has to pass night and day, the two halves of the month, the months, the Ṛtus and the year, meets one Ṛtu, does not give the correct answer to the question *ko 'si puruṣa* and is obstructed by that single Ṛtu (JB. 1, 46); d) insertion of *devayāna* with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* in JB. 1, 18; e) combination of the eschatologies of 1, 46 and 1, 49-50 in a *pitṛyāna — devayāna* couple as a result of which the announcement to the Ṛtus is replaced by the question *ko 'si puruṣa* of one Ṛtu.

The verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* in the version of JB. 1, 50 may contain some secondary additions. On the other hand, *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* of 1, 50 seems to yield a more correct metre. ChU. and BĀU. more or less correspond to JB. 1, 45 (for the end of 45 see ChU. 5, 9, 1 *iti nu pañcamyām āhutāv āpaḥ puruṣavacaso bhavanti*; BĀU. 6, 2, 13 *tasyā āhuteḥ puruṣaḥ saṃbhavati*); 1, 46 first paragraph (especially BĀU. 6, 2, 14); 1, 49 (the path through the divisions of time divided into a dark and a bright one by the upaniṣads). KauṣU. 1, 2 follows JB. 1, 50 (the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*). The verse *vicakṣaṇād* and the *pañcāgnividyā* refer to the same water doctrine which explains the origin of (human) life on earth. Both are found in an eschatological context in JB., but this text does not seem to contain any references to a never ending cycle of fluid, to a transmigration. The later assumption of a "Wasserkreislauf" in the upaniṣads involves claims by kṣatriyas to the authorship of this doctrine. On this point see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. II and VI.

45. The one that shines here (the sun), that is Agni Vaiśvānara.[1] Its fuel is the night, its flame[2] the day, its smoke the rays of the sun, its sparks the stars, its coals the moon. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer immortality, the (heavenly) waters.[3] From this oblation when it has been offered King Soma[4] comes into existence.

The thunder is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is heaven, its flame the lightning, its smoke the clouds, its sparks the hailstones,[5] its coals the thunderbolt. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer King Soma. From this oblation when it has been offered rain comes into existence.

The earth is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the atmosphere, its flame

the fire, its smoke the wind, its sparks the shining motes in the air, its coals the quarters. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer rain. From this oblation when it has been offered food[6] comes into existence.

Man is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is speech, its flame sight, its smoke breath, its sparks mind, its coals hearing. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer food. From this oblation when it has been offered seed comes into existence.

Woman[7] is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the vagina, its flame the vulva, its smoke desire (?),[8] its sparks the feelings of enjoyment, its coals the coitus. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer seed. From this oblation when it has been offered man comes into existence.

Thus in this fifth creation man is born from the gods. At the fifth creation the divine waters speak with a human voice.[9] And when[9] he goes to yonder world —

46 — his (funeral) fire is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the herbs and trees, its flame is just the flame (of the fire), its smoke just the smoke, its sparks just the sparks, its coals just the coals. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer man. From this oblation when it has been offered man comes into existence (and goes) to yonder world.[10] That is for him the world in which he resurges.

Of that god who shines here[11] night and day, the half-months, the months, the seasons and the year are the guards. Night and day are forerunners (who announce his coming).[12] To[13] him one of the seasons, who has a hammer in his hand,[14] comes down along a ray of light and asks him: "Who art thou, man?"[13] In case he has some (but not the perfect) knowledge he may withhold (his name from the interrogator).[15] Then he strikes at him (with his hammer). Of him when he has been stopped the good works disappear in three parts.[16] He (i.e. the Ṛtu) takes one third. One third diffuses in the air. Together with one third he (i.e. the deceased) descends in the direction of this world.[17] The world which is won by him on account of his gifts, in that he stops. Thereupon even him Death ultimately reaches. Repeated dying is not overcome by him who[18] knows (only) thus.

[....]

49. [...]

Of[19] him when he has caught fire the smoke *(dhūma)* shakes off the body. Because it shakes off *(dhunoti)*[20] therefore it is *dhuna*. In

fact it is *dhuna* by name. They call it mystically[21] *dhūma* in a mystic way of speaking. For the gods are fond of the mystic.[21] From the smoke he goes to the night, from the night to the day, from the day to the half-month of the waning moon, from the half-month of the waning moon to the half-month of the waxing moon, from the half-month of the waxing moon to the month.[22] There in the month both the body and the life-spirit come together.[23] To[24] him one of the seasons, who has a hammer in his hand, comes down along a ray of light and asks him: "Who art thou, man?"[24]

50. Him he should answer:[25]

"O, Seasons, from the radiant one, which is pressed out every half month, from the one which is connected with the pitṛs the seed is produced". — That they offer there the radiant King Soma, that (is meant by) this.[26]

"As such you sent me in a man as your agent". — For they send him here in a man as their agent.

"From that man, your agent, you emitted me in a mother". — For he (the father) emits him in a mother.

"Thus I am produced, being added by the thirteenfold one as the additional month of the twelve".[27] — It is the thirteenfold one which burns here.

"This I know, of this I am sure. So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality, through[28] the twelve- or thirteenfold father, through this mother, through this faith, through this food, through this truth.[28] Day is my father, night my mother. I am truth.[29] So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality".

Him the seasons take with them. As one who knows one who likewise knows, as one who understands one who likewise understands[30] so the seasons take him with them. They admit him (to heaven)[31] He who knows thus is not a human being; he is one of the gods if he has this knowledge.[32] The fathers and grandfathers, swift as thought,[33] approach him (saying): "What, dear son,[34] have you brought us?" He should answer them: "Whatever good I have done that is yours". His sons enter upon his inheritance, his fathers upon (the effect of) his good deeds, his enemies upon (the effect of) his evil deeds.[35] Having thus made this threefold division he goes to co-existence in one world with the one that burns here.

NOTES

[1] Instead of *agnir vaiśvānaraḥ* BĀU. and ChU. have only *agniḥ*. The epithet *vaiśvānara-* (for which see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 699 a) indicates that this fire is not just an ordinary sacrificial fire, but forms one of the manifestations of the cosmic power Agni. Cf. ŚB. 6, 6, 1, 5 *(vaiśvānara = sarve 'gnayaḥ)*. See also ŚB. 10, 6, 1, where *pṛthivī, āpaḥ, ākāśaḥ, vāyuḥ, ādityaḥ* and *dyauḥ* are successively identified with Agni Vaiśvānara, but ultimately turn out to be only partial manifestations of that Agni Vaiśvānara which is the cosmic Puruṣa. This cosmic Agni is called Ātman Vaiśvānara in a later version of that passage (ChU. 5, 11 ff.)

[2] BĀU. and ChU. have *arciḥ* instead of *jyotiḥ*.

[3] *amṛtam āpaḥ*. On the meaning of this first oblation and its relation to the version of the upaniṣads (which have *śraddhā* instead) see the introduction of this section. Probably *amṛtam* and *apaḥ* are appositional rather than asyndetically placed together (and referring to two different oblations). They are often equated. See e.g. MS. 4, 1, 9: 11. 1; ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 7; 4, 4, 3, 15 *amṛtaṃ vā āpaḥ;* GB. 2, 1, 3 *amṛtam āpaḥ;* AB. 8, 20, 1 *amṛtaṃ vā etad asmiṃl loke yad āpaḥ;* ŚāṅkhB. 12, 1 *amṛtatvaṃ vā āpaḥ;* ŚB. 3, 9, 4, 16; TB. 1, 7, 6, 3 *amṛtā hy āpaḥ*. It is interesting that not only *amṛtam*, but also *śraddhā* is associated with water. See e.g. MS. 4, 1, 4: 6.1; 1, 4, 10: 59.3 (KS. 32, 7; TS. 1, 6, 8, 1); TB. 3, 2, 4, 1. Frequently *śraddhā* is associated with *satyam* (see Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 109), which itself is also identified with water (Lévi, o.c., p. 160). All these identifications seem to be based on the fact that the central conceptions of Vedic religion such as *ṛta, satya, brahman, tapas* etc. are situated in the heavenly waters (see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 644 ff.). The *śraddhā* which forms the first oblation in the upaniṣadic parallels may therefore be connected with those above-mentioned central conceptions, which are not only situated in the immortal, heavenly waters, but are also identical with them. Such abstract conceptions can be "rained" down to earth. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 24 *dharmo vā āpas tasmād yademaṃ lokam āpa āgacchanti sarvam evedaṃ yathādharmaṃ bhavaty atha yadāvṛṣṭir bhavati balīyān eva tarhy abalīyasa ādatte dharmo hy āpaḥ*. On account of the context in BĀU. and ChU. (notably the question on the waters which get a human voice after the fifth oblation) one may assume that originally *āpaḥ* formed the first oblation. The source of the upaniṣads may have read *śraddhām apaḥ* (cf. JB. *amṛtam apaḥ*). In spite of passages as JUB. 3, 3, 1, 4 *athaitat tṛtīyam mriyate yan mriyate sa śraddhām evābhisambhavati;* 3, 3, 1, 7 *tad etayā cainaṃ śraddhayā samardhayati yayaivainam etac chraddhayāgnāv abhyādadhati* I do not think that *śraddhā* has to be connected with the cremation and that it makes the cycle complete. This *śraddhā* starting the stream of immortal fluid from heaven does not originate from earth. As an alternative explanation one might assume that the gods start this chain of sacrifices with a mental sacrifice in which *śraddhā* forms the immaterial (instead of the concrete) oblation out of which the fluid ultimately arises. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V, n. 15.

[4] For the position of Soma in the heavenly waters and its descent by way of rain see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 701 f. See also o.c. I, p. 202 ff. on the heavenly Soma and p. 239 referring to Soma as *apāṃ garbhaḥ*.

[5] *hlādunayaḥ*. See Oertel, o.c., p. 136.

[6] Cf. ŚB. 2, 1, 1, 3 *annaṃ hi vā āpas tasmād yademaṃ lokam āpa āgacchanty athehānnādyaṃ jāyate*. See further *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B.

[7] Read with Oertel *stry evāgnir* instead of *striyo vā agnir*.

[8] *iṣyā*. See Oertel, o.c., p. 136.

[9] Oertel's translation "at the fifth creation the divine waters endowed with human speech say how he proceeds to yonder world" (o.c., p. 135) is quite untenable in view of ChU. 5, 9, 1 *iti nu pañcamyām āhutāv āpaḥ puruṣavacaso bhavanti*. Instead of cancelling *atha* (as Oertel does) one may conjecture *yadā* for *yathā*. Cf. BĀU. 6, 2, 13-14 *atha yadā mriyate — athainam agnaye haranti tasyāgnir evāgnir bhavati* .. etc.

[10] Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 136 observes that the acc. *amuṃ lokam* is odd. Either a loc. would be expected, or the preposition *abhi* should be supplied. The phrase *tasyā āhuter hutāyai .. sambhavati* is, however, stereotyped in this passage. Moreover coming into existence in this series of sacrifies takes place on the spot where is sacrificed. The rain e.g., which is the result of sacrificing soma in the atmosphere, comes into existence in the atmosphere and only afterwards reaches the earth. So the puruṣa is not born in yonder world (loc.), but comes into existence out of the pyre and thence arises to yonder world (acc.). The stereotyped phrasing of this passage prevented the author from expressing himself in a more exact way. That may be the reason why he adds: *so 'sya lokaḥ punarutthāyai bhavati* "That (yonder) world is for his resurrection", i.e. "there his coming into existence is realized in fact".

[11] *tasya haitasya devasya* (initial position) and *ya eṣa tapati* (final position) belong together. The predicative noun *goptā* (sing.) is congruent with the last of the series of subjects, *saṃvatsaraḥ* (sing.). See Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 87; Speyer, *Ved. u. Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 31. The year is the last obstacle. Gaining or reaching the year means obtaining immortality. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 2, 12 *martyā ha vā agre devā āsuḥ. sa yadaiva te saṃvatsaram āpur athāmṛtā āsuḥ sarvaṃ vai saṃvatsaraḥ sarvaṃ vā akṣayyam eteno hāsyākṣayyaṃ sukṛtaṃ bhavaty akṣayyo lokaḥ*; JB. 1, 252 *sa haivaṃ vidvān ahorātrayor ardhamāsaśo māsaśa ṛtuśas saṃvatsaraśa etasmin sarvasminn ātmānam upasaṃdhāya taṃ mṛtyuṃ tarati yas svarge loke na haivaṃvit punar mriyate*.

[12] Text and translation are doubtful. Caland conjectured *pracaret* for *pracare* in his transcript of the ms. Burnell 421 (Univ. Libr. Utrecht, Caland mss. nr. 6), which hardly makes more sense. Perhaps *pracare* (dual) refers to the function of night and day, which are forerunners announcing the visitor to the more important guards, the Ṛtus, who send one of them to examine the deceased.

[13] The same sentence is found at the end of JB. 1, 49. See the introduction of this section.

[14] The meaning of *kūṭa-* in *kūṭahasta-* is "hammer". See Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 114, n. 2. A. K. Coomaraswamy, *I.H.Q.* 14, p. 53, n. 60 starting from *kūṭa-* "roof-plate" concludes: "... since the Season descends from the sun and is the messenger of the solar Judge, we suppose again that this means that he has in hand as his weapon a *discus*, analogous to the solar disc, which is the roof-plate of the universe. (..) kūṭahasta then is tantamount to 'armed with the sun'". He does not, however, explain the relation between sun in heaven and sun as a weapon. Moreover a disc is hardly a striking-weapon *(tasya ha praharati!)*. For *kūṭa-* meaning "hammer" see e.g. JB. 2, 90 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 149 f.) *tad yathā mayūkhena vā tikṣṇenābhinidhāya śaṅkunā vā kūṭenābhihanyād .. tad yathāgninā'śmānam abhyoṣya taṃ kūṭena bhindyād* .. For the hammer in sun- and death-cult see H. Hartmann, *Der Totenkult in Irland* (Heidelberg 1952), p. 89. Yama's messengers likewise bear a hammer MārkP. 10, 59 (see Scherman, *Ind. Visionslitt.*, p. 27).

[15] *sa kiṃ vidvān pravṛñjyāt*. In this difficult sentence *sa* seems to refer to the deceased, whose reaction on the question is described. The only correct answer is the verse *vicakṣaṇād* (1, 50). Answering by personal or family

name is completely wrong (cf. 1, 18). Does this passage represent something between the two? The dead does not reach the sun. On the other hand he is allowed to live on in his reserved *loka*, but not in eternity: *anavajito hāsya punarmṛtyur bhavati sa ya evaṃvit syāt.* Evidently *evaṃvit* refers to *kiṃ vidvān.* Here *kim* (hardly to be taken as the interrogative pronoun) may express inferiority or deficiency as in compounds and in *kim adhīte* (Kāś. on Pāṇ. 8, 1, 44 quoted by M.-W.). The *kiṃvidvān* and the *evaṃvid* of 1, 46 who has only a mediocre knowledge is to be compared to the *evaṃvid* of 1, 50 *(sa haiṣa na manuṣyo ya evaṃ veda. devānāṃ ha vai sa eko ya evaṃvit).* The interpretation of *pra-vṛj-* forms a problem. Mostly this verb is used in its ritualistic sense ("to put on the fire"). Moreover the root *vṛj-* has several significations. For one of the few passages in which *pra-vṛj-* occurs without any reference to fires see JB. 1, 61 *prāco nvā ayaṃ yajamānasya prāṇān prāvṛkṣan mariṣyaty ayaṃ yajamānaḥ.* The parallel passage ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 6 has *prāco nvā ayaṃ yajamānasya prāṇān prārautsīt.* Does *pra-rudh-* here mean "to hold back" and may *pra-vṛj-* have the meaning "to hold back, keep back, withhold something from a person, suppress or conceal information" (here referring to withholding his name when asked for it)? According to M.-W. the *ātmanepadam* of *vṛj-* may denote "to keep anything from". The meaning "to strike down" which is used in Eggeling's translation of ŚB. 1, 3, 3, 14 would, if applied in the present passage, require the Ṛtu as subject. This would imply a completely different interpretation of this passage in which the Season, if he should have got some information *(sa kiṃ vidvān)* in the form of an answer which mentions the name, would strike down, exclude or throw out (a meaning also suitable at ŚB. 3, 2, 4, 13 and JB. 1, 61) the deceased.

[16] A different threefold division is found 1, 50. Here the Ṛtu seems to take one third (and go back to heaven), one third disappears on the spot and with one third the deceased descends in the direction of the earth. A triple division is often connected with the three worlds.

[17] I render "in the direction of this world", because reaching the earth seems to be excluded here. The words *mṛtyur evāntata āpnoti* and *punarmṛtyu-* obviously point to a life in yonder world (but not in the highest heaven which is reserved for the immortals). The dead is obstructed by the Ṛtu, falls back in the direction of the earth, but stops *(niramate)* in a *loka* which he has won by his gifts.

[18] *sa* is superfluous in *sa ya evaṃvit syāt*, since *asya* is the antecedent. Cf. 1, 9 *sa yathāhir ahicchavyai nirmucyeta (..) evam eva sarvasmāt pāpmano nirmucyeta sa ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti*, where *sa* resumes the antecedent. It seems to be used on the analogy of those cases in which the relative clause precedes the main clause. See e.g. 1, 18 *sa yo ha .. taṃ hāha;* 1, 44 *sa ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhoti nainam amuṣmin loke ..* There *sa* may be taken as a nominative pendens, but perhaps it already forms the first phase of the so-called expletive *sa*. According to Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 119 a this *sa* ("dit expletif ou initial figé") does not occur outside ŚB. but in BŚS., VādhS. and twice in AB. He observes that "l'extension réelle du procédé nous échappe (Ren. J. As. 1937, 332 n. 2)". In JB., however, some instances of this use can be found. In the last 65 chapters of the second book, which I have checked as a counterpart of 1, 1-65, I have noticed 2, 403 *sa yathā śāradam ukṣāṇaṃ vāgarābhiḥ paritatyālabherann evam evaitad parimādbhir mahāvratam ālabhante;* 2, 434 *sa yatra ṣoḍaśinaṃ kuryur arśo vaiṣāṃ jāyeta vardhma vā;* 2, 435 *sa yad atra ṣoḍaśinaṃ kuryur dvāviṃśatiś caikavimśās saṃpadyeran;* 2, 439 *sa yathā pitarau putraṃ pūrvaṃ yantaṃ paścād anvi-*

yātāṃ tādṛk. In JB. 1, 1-65 such clear instances are lacking, but that does not prove this use was unknown to the author of the agnihotra section. In several cases in which *sa* can be explained as having a function in the sentence the possibility is not excluded that this "functional" use of *sa* is accidental or not felt as such. An exhaustive study of the initial words in the sentence pattern of the Vedic prose will undoubtedly throw light on this matter and establish a definite relationship between texts (and their subdivisions). Probably many agreements between JB. and ŚB. will be found. JB. shows a tendency to open its sentences with *sa ya, sa yathā* etc. The following possibilities are found:

sa ya — *sa* subject of the main clause.
sa ya — *sa* resumed by *sa* or *eṣa* in the main clause.
sa ya — *sa* resumed by *asya, tasya, tam* etc.
sa ya — *sa* resumed, but not by a pronoun. See e.g. JB. 3, 372 *sa yo ha sa puruṣaḥ* (thus should be read) *ya evaṃ vedaivaṃvidi ha vai prāṇaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ*.
sa ya — *sa* in the turn of phrase *sa yaḥ .. brūyād (anuvyāhared) .. tathā haiva syād (syuḥ)*. See e.g. 1, 61; 335; 2, 32; 37; 434; 436. See also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 55 ff. quoting no instances of *sa ya* from AB., which has only *ya* (against ŚāṅkhB.; ŚB.; Up.).
sa yathā *(yadā, yatra, yadi, yāvad, yad, yam, yām, yad* etc.*)*
— *sa* subject of the main clause (sporadically resumed by *eṣa*).
— *sa* subject of the subordinate clause.
— *sa* subject of the main as well as of the subordinate clause.

It is worth mentioning that especially in the *sa yathā* sentences one may often doubt if *sa* has to be considered the subject of the subordinate clause. A comparison of the *sa yathā* with the *tad yathā* sentence pattern would be useful. A statistic research of several brāhmaṇas together with an investigation of a limited number of contexts might yield interesting results. That *sa* often can be taken as the subject of the *yathā* clause need not surprise us, since in comparisons the subject mostly is "one" (French "on", Sanskrit *sa*). In a sentence as JB. 2, 386 *sa yathā putraḥ pitṝn anusaṃcaret tādṛg evaitad* probably *sa* should not be taken with *putraḥ* and is as superfluous as at JB. 1, 341 *sa yathā kṣatraṃ vidvad rājaputravat syāt tādṛk tat* (cf. also 2, 2 *sa yathā .. pateyur .. evaivaṃ tad yad .. upayanti*). The same problem arises in connection with *sa yad*. In these ritualistic texts *sa* often can be explained as "he, the sacrificer" or "he, the officiant". It is, however, conceivable that *sa* sometimes only makes a distinction with the *tad yad* sentences, *tad yad* meaning "thereby that (he)", *sa yad* "if (when) he". *sa* seems to be quite superfluous before the rel. pron. *yad* JB. 2, 68 *sa yad evāsmin dīkṣite yaśo bhavati tad asminn utthite yaśo bhavati*. The difference with *tad yad .. tad* may, however, be that the latter construction means "that which .. that", whereas *sa yad .. tad* implies "if any (i.e. whatever) ... that". All these different uses of *sa* before *ya, yathā, yad* etc., favoured by the tendency to begin sentences with a demonstrative pronoun and to place *ya, yathā, yad* etc. on the second place — *sa ya* etc. is often taken up by *atha ya* throughout a whole chapter — have resulted in a superfluous, indeclinable *sa*, used for stylistic reasons. In *sa yat prathamam upamārṣṭi tena gandharvāpsarasaḥ prīṇāti* (JB. 1, 41) the author could as well have written *tad yat prathamam ..* Just as *sa yathā* and *tad yathā* one should also compare *sa yad* and *tad yad* in Vedic prose. Not only at the beginning, but also in the middle of a sentence

sa may precede *ya*, *yathā* etc. See e.g. JB. 1, 41 *atha yad dvir aṅgulyā prāśnāti sa yat prathamaṃ prāśnāti tena prāṇāpānau tṛpyataḥ*. Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 20 considers ChU. 5, 1, 12 *atha ha prāṇa uccikramiṣant sa yathā suhayaḥ paḍbīśaśaṅkūnt saṃkhided evam itarān prāṇānt samakhidat* ("Then breath, getting ready to depart, — it, as a fine steed would ..", tr. Oertel) to be an instance of the proleptic nominative construction. Here *sa*, however, hardly has the force of a resumptive pronoun, but is placed before *yathā* just as at the beginning of sentences. The same may be said of *sa* in the present passage, in which it seems to throw into relief the conditional force of the relative pronoun. According to Keith, *Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 291, n. 2 the use of this superfluous *sa* (in *sa yadi*) is a sign of lateness.

[19] After the sūtra-like insertion without any brāhmaṇa features the text at once continues with a typical brāhmaṇa etymology. On these "etymologies" see Gonda, *Lingua* 5, p. 61 and Lévi, *Doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 6.

[20] On shaking off the body see also JB. 1, 252 *sa eṣo 'pahatapāpmā dhūtaśarīro 'tītyaitaṃ mṛtyuṃ śarīraṃ dhūnute;* JUB. 3, 6, 2, 2 *śarīrāṇy adhūnot;* 3, 7, 2, 1 f. *kalāśa evāsya tac charīrāṇy adhūnot. sa eṣo 'pahatapāpmā dhūtaśarīraḥ;* AB. 4, 24, 1 *śarīram eva tābhir dhūnute*. Remarkably the present passage *(śarīraṃ dhunoti)* uses the active form with *u* instead of *ū*. This may imply that JB. 1, 49 and 252 do not belong to the same stage of this brāhmaṇa. See also Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb. Forms*, p. 39.

[21] For this phrase occurring with some differences ŚB., TB., AB., GB. and AĀ. see Keith, *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka* (Oxford 1909), p. 232, n. 14. Remarkably ŚB. invariably has *parokṣam* and *parokṣakāmāḥ* against *parokṣena* and *parokṣapriyāḥ* of the other texts. It agrees only once (14, 6, 11, 2) with them. As the phrase does not occur in the first five books and in a different form in the upaniṣad, it may give a clue for the relation of (parts of) texts. Here JB. *iti parokṣam ācakṣate parokṣenaiva parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ* by its double use of the adverb to some extent combines the two versions. Again an agreement between these two brāhmaṇas. JUB. frequently has *parokṣam* (without the addition *parokṣapriyāḥ hi devāḥ*). For *parokṣeneva* see JUB. 3, 3, 2, 6. According to Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 18 (referring to JB. 2, 419) in this connection *iva* should mean "noch" ("mit noch einem Hintersinn"). I doubt, however, if his rendering of *parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ* (ŚB. 14, 6, 11, 2) "Denn die Götter lieben, was noch einen Hintersinn hat" is correct. One would expect (if this interpretation of *iva* would be accepted) a translation: "Denn die Götter lieben noch, was einen Hintersinn hat". This phrase is also found in VādhS. (*A.O.* 6, p. 111 ... *ity ācakṣate parokṣena parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ;* cf. also p. 120).

[22] The later versions of the upaniṣads (BĀU.; ChU.) divide this path into a dark side (the *pitṛyāna*) and a bright one (the *devayāna*). On this division see also VādhS. 4, 28 a (*A.O.* 6, p. 133), where the dark half of the year, of the month (*avāchannāparapakṣa*, cf. JB. *apocchantīpakṣa*) and of the day is connected with the pitṛs. ŚB. 2, 1, 3, 1 ff. three seasons are associated with the pitṛs, three with the gods. The uniform path (JB.; KauṣU.) ending with the examination by the doorkeeper is definitely older. A similar course through the divisions of time is found JB. 1, 46.

[23] Cf. section 17-18, n. 14.

[24] See n. 13.

[25] See the introduction and section 17-18 on this verse.

[26] *yad ado vicakṣaṇaṃ somaṃ rājānaṃ juhvati tat tat*. Windisch' rendering (o.c., p. 118) "Was sie dort dem Weisen, dem König Soma opfern, alles das (bildet den Samen)" is untenable. More or less correct are the translations by

Oertel, o.c., p. 113; Frenz, o.c., p. 128 and Hertel, o.c., p. 155. The last-named scholar observes in a note: "Diese falschen Erklärungen zeigen dass schon dem Verfasser des Brāhmaṇa der Sinn der Verse nicht mehr klar war". The author of the brāhmaṇa, however, gives a better interpretation of the verse than some modern scholars. The present forms *juhvati, erayante* and *āsiñcanti* fairly agree with the injunctives of the verse (which may have formed one of the reasons of these explanations). Obviously *adas* means "there, in heaven" against *etat* "here, on earth" in the next explanation *puṃsi hy enam etat kartary erayante*. The author correctly takes *prasutāt* as derived from *pra-su* "to press". The Seasons offer King Soma just as the gods in the *pañcāgnividyā* (second sacrifice). Man is produced by the representatives of Time, which together form the Year (= the Sun, which also plays a role in this context). The semen, King Soma, is sometimes likewise equated with the year, e.g. TB. 1, 6, 8, 2 *saṃvatsaro vai somaḥ pitṛmān*.

[27] *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* instead of JB. 1, 18 *dvādaśena trayodaśopamāsaḥ*. Cf. also *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitrā* in this context and KauṣU. 1, 2 *dvādaśatrayodaśa upamāso dvādaśatrayodaśena pitrā*. Oertel, o.c., p. 118 prefers the version of 1, 50 on account of its meaning. According to Windisch, o.c., p. 121 the numerals have been transposed and 1, 50 represents the original text, whereas Hertel, o.c., p. 152, n. 2 is in favour of the opposite view. Renou, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, p. 19, n. 29 taking KauṣU. as a combination of the two JB. versions on account of the compound *dvādaśatrayodaśa-* (a wrong argument since *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitrā* already occurs JB. 1, 50) states: "de toute manière JB., I, 50, 1 est une corruption de 18, 2". He does not, however, adduce any arguments for this assertion. This verse is undoubtedly older than both JB. passages. Some small differences in the transmission of this verse do not prove anything on the relation between the complete passages. The verse and its context are inserted in JB. 1, 18, whereas the version of 1, 50 may have added some phrases to the end of the verse (see the introductory note). The differences between the two versions in this particular line seem to imply that JB. 1, 50 is more original. The numerals *dvādaśa-* and *trayodaśa-* being unaccented here may signify "twelfth", "thirteenth" or "twelve". "thirteen", but also "twelvefold", "thirteenfold". Therefore several translations are possible. As a designation of the year *trayodaśa-* and *dvādaśa-* are, though the year is mostly regarded as twelvefold, equally admissible. See e.g. ŚB. 14, 1, 3, 28 *trayodaśa sampādayati trayodaśa vai māsāḥ saṃvatsarasya saṃvatsara eṣa ya eṣa tapati* (cf. JB. 1, 50 *eṣa trayodaśo ya eṣa tapati*). JB. 1, 18 *trayodaśopamāsaḥ* only admits of the dubious interpretation "thirteenth (intercalary) month". whereas *dvādaśopamāsaḥ* may be interpreted as "additional month of the twelvefold (year)/of the twelve (other months)/of the twelfth (month)". Moreover the metre favours *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* (⏑ – ⏑ – –, – ⏑ / – ⏑ – ⏑) rather than *dvādaśena trayodaśopamāsaḥ* (– ⏑ – –, ⏑ – ⏑ / – ⏑ – ⏑).

[28] Windisch, o.c., p. 122 (who is followed by Frenz, o.c., p. 128) takes *tayā mātrā tayā śraddhayā tenānnādyena tena satyena* as "durch das Manenopfer *(śraddhā)* als die Mutter, durch die Wahrheit als Speise und Trank". Probably, however, *śraddhā, annādyam, satyam* and in the KauṣU. parallel *tapas* are so-called "Zentralbegriffe" (Lüders, *Varuṇa*, p. 644 ff.) which are to be localized in heaven, in the heavenly waters, and are identical with the Ṛta and (later) Brahman. The thirteenfold (= the Year, the Sun, the Highest Principle) is the father, but at the same time the mother, it is Faith, Food, Reality (Truth), Tapas etc. This duality in unity of the Year (= Time) as father/mother seems to be expressed by "Day is my father,

night is my mother" i.e. "Time represents my parents". For *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitrā tayā mātrā* perhaps meaning "by the twelve- or thirteenfold one who is the father, the same who is the mother" one may compare JUB. 1, 13, 2, 4 .. *aditir mātā sa pitā sa putraḥ* "Aditi is the mother, she is the father, she is the son" (tr. Oertel). The instrumentals, in the context to be translated by "through" and to be construed with *ānayadhvam*, originally may have formed an addition (or gloss) to the instrumental *trayodaśena* (the father by whom man is produced as an additional month).

[29] *satyam asmi*. Cf. KauṣU. 1, 6 *yas tvam asi so 'ham asmīti tam āha ko 'ham asmīti satyam iti*. The equivalent of *satyam* is the Ṛta, the highest principle.

[30] Read with the crit. ed. *vidvāṃsam* and *jānantam* (see section 17-18, n. 28). Frenz, o.c., p. 127, n. 36 is not right in assuming a "Bild vom Reisenden und Reiseführer". The Ṛtus accept the deceased "who knows thus" as an initiated, as one of their own people. It is to be noted that middle forms *(ānayante; atyarjayante)* are used, whereas active forms would be more suitable in the case of hired "Reiseführer". Does *ānayate* refer to introducing an initiated, accepted person to the own group and to admitting him in their midst ("let me come; take me with you")?

[31] This verb is found only in AB. among the brāhmaṇas. It occurs as *atyarjati/e* (but the tenth present class does not seem to change the meaning of *arj-*). AB. 1, 10 and 3, 42 the verb is used in a similar context (admittance to heaven).

[32] Cf. ŚB. 10, 3, 5, 13 *sa ha sa na manuṣyo ya evaṃvid devānāṃ haiva sa ekaḥ*.

[33] Cf. Caland, *Altindischer Ahnencult* (Leiden 1893), p. 11: "Beim saṃsādanam gebraucht er den spruch: *yantu pitaro yathālokaṃ manasā javena*".

[34] Instead of *tataḥ* Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 27, n. 5 reads *tata*. Notice, however, that JB. 1, 43 (Bhṛgu story) *tata* is used in addressing the father, whereas the son is addressed with *tāta*. See also JB. 2, 9 on *tata* "father". We have accepted Thieme's emendation with some doubts. If *tataḥ* is retained, it either denotes "therefrom, from the earth", or it is used as in the turn of phrase *kiṃ nas tato bhaviṣyate* (ŚB. 8, 4, 2, 2; for parallels and variants see Oertel, *Z.I.I.* 5, p. 123).

[35] Cf. JB. 1, 18; KauṣU. 1, 4; Manu 6, 79 (see Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3, p. 29, n. 1).

46 (end)–49 (first half). *The funeral rites*

Literature: Caland, *Die Altindischen Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche*, Amsterdam Academy 1896 (hereafter called *Bestattungsgebräuche*). Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* IV (Poona 1953), p. 179 ff. *Śrautakośa* I, *Sanskrit / English Section* (Poona 1958 / 1962), p. 764 ff. / 1033 ff. Caland, *The Pitṛmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiranyakeśin, Gautama* (*Abh. K.M.* 10/3), Leipzig 1896. Idem, *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba* III (Amsterdam Academy 1928), p. 420 ff. [tr. of ĀpŚS. 31, the pitṛmedhasūtra, which is almost identical to HirPiS. and BhārPiS.]. C. H. Raabe, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Hindoesche doodenritueel*, Leiden 1911 [thesis Utrecht containing the crit. ed. of BPiS. 2 and 3, the secondary BPiS.]. C. G. Kashikar, *The Śrauta, Paitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bhāradvāja* I (Text), p. 227 ff.; II (Translation), p. 460 ff. (Poona 1964) [Introduction of the Text, p. XLIV ff., contains a revised reprint of a paper on BhārPiS., HirPiS. and ĀpPiS., read at the 20th *A.I.O.C.* and published *J.O.R.M.* 28 (1958/59), p. 1 ff. The author proves that the other two sūtras are mere borrowings from BhārPiS.]. Hillebrandt, *Ritualliteratur*, p. 87 ff. For an edition and translation of the present section see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19 (1988), p. 103 ff. For a translation of JB. 1, 49 see also Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden*, p. 153 ff. and A. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1969), p. 127 f.

The funeral rites belong to the saṃskāras and consequently are described in the gṛhya sūtras or in separate pitṛmedha sūtras. Some śrauta sūtras, however, also deal with this ritual, which may relate to the āhitāgni. Its mantras are found in ṚV., AV. and TĀ. Among the brāhmaṇas ŚB. is the only text which contains a full treatment of the ritual of death. It starts (ŚB. 12, 5, 1) with an agnihotra expiation (the death of the agnihotrin abroad; cf. AB. 7, 2). The description of the ritual (ŚB. 12, 5, 2) agrees with the present JB. section with regard to the ritualistic details. The great difference, however, is that the passage in ŚB. has all the characteristics of a brāhmaṇa, whereas the JB. section in no respect is distinguishable from a sūtra. The only brāhmaṇa-like passages are the end of 1, 47 *so 'ta āhutimayo* .. etc., which evidently has been taken from JB. 1, 2, and the end of this section dealing with the inflammation of the corpse by the three fires and its meaning (this is, however, also found in several sūtras). This section may be regarded as an insertion from a sūtra; an insertion made in an eschatological context in which cremation plays a role (beginning of JB. 1, 46; cf. also the beginning of JB. 1, 18, where the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* follows as in this context in JB. 1, 50).

The Jaiminīyas also deal with the funeral ceremonies in their gṛhyasūtra (JGS. 2, 4). See Caland, *De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigṛhyasūtra*, Amsterdam Academy 1905 [hereafter referred to as JGS. ed.; see especially p. 9 ff. of the introduction with regard to the cremation] and *The Jaiminigṛhyasūtra*, Lahore 1922 [hereafter to be called JGS. ed./tr.; besides the text and the English version of the introduction

of JGS. ed., it contains an English translation; for the present subject see p. VII]. The sūtra-like insertion in JB. cannot have belonged to JGS. (as it is transmitted to us) since the sūtra refers to the brāhmaṇa.

Strangely enough Śrīnivāsa's commentary on JGS., called Subodhinī (for extracts see Caland's ed. and ed./tr.), while dealing with the funeral ritual, comments on the present section in JB. The ms. of the Subodhinī is found in the India Office. I have used Caland's transcript (Univ. Libr. Utrecht, Caland MSS., not listed). For the following discussion of this commentary see also Caland's extracts at the end of the two editions and his remarks in the introductions.

After dealing with JGS. 2, 3 it announces *itaḥ param āhitāgneḥ śarīranāśe ityādi* (see beginning of JGS. 2, 4) *dahanādisāpiṇḍyāntavidhāyakasūtrāṇy ante vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. Indeed it comments on JGS. 2, 4 (announced by *atha dahanapaṭalo vyākhyāyate*) at the end (after 2, 8 *anaśnatsaṃhitākalpaḥ*; it does not seem to have known 2, 7 and 9). Śrīnivāsa may have deliberately transferred the funeral ritual to the end *(ante)* in order to insert without restraint a lengthy brāhmaṇa passage without disturbing the total composition too much. He correctly observes that the sūtra first deals with the āhitāgni whose corpse is lost and then with the *anaṣṭaśarīra (sati śarīra ityādinā*; the printed text reads *satīśarīram*; see Caland's crit. app.). After the treatment of the *naṣṭaśarīra*, however, the commentary on the *anaṣṭaśarīra*'s funeral rites does not refer to *satīśarīram* (r. *sati śarīra*) *uptakeśam* .., but deals with the present JB. section (introduced by *atha āhitāgneḥ kramasaṃskāra ucyate*): *sa yadopatāpī syād* .. etc. (JB. 1, 46 end – 48; some references to 1, 49). It is to be noted that the JB. quotation correctly starts with *sa yadopatāpī*, whereas the sūtra itself contains in 2, 4 a quotation *(ya evaṃvit syāt sa yadopatāpī syād)* which surprisingly includes the last words of the preceding section. As to the significance of the commentary with regard to the details of this section see Caland's introduction to JGS. and our notes to the translation. The first paragraph of 1, 49 is not commented upon because the custom of the *anustaraṇī* had gone out of use in the time of the commentator: *ita ūrdhvaṃ saṃstaraṇīṃ nāma gāṃ hatvā tasyās tat tad aṅgāni paretasya tat tad aṅgeṣu vinyasanādividhiḥ kalāv anupayuktatvān na vyākhyātaḥ*. Then he continues with *āsye hiraṇyaśakalam ādāya* (r. *ādhāya*; this sentence is found in JGS. ed. 2, 4: 30. 3) *upari kāṣṭhāni saṃstīrya yathāsthitam agnīn prohya upadīpayanti* (apparently a combination of JGS. ed. 2, 4: 30. 3 f. *agnīn upohya* and JB. 1, 49 *saṃstīryopadīpayanti*). Since *upari kāṣṭhāni* is missing in JB. as well as JGS., one may assume that Śrīnivāsa has used a text of JB. which reads *upari kāṣṭhāni saṃstīrya* and that our mss. contain a gap before *saṃstīrya* (which in that case would not refer to the *anustaraṇī* ritual; but remarkably enough the Subodhinī speaks of a *saṃstaraṇī* instead of an *anustaraṇī* cow). After *upadīpayanti* the text of the commentary continues (in accordance with JB. 1, 49) *sa tathaiva cikīrṣed yathainam āhavanīyaḥ prathamo gacchet tathainaṃ* (JB. *tad enaṃ*) *devalokaḥ pratyāgacchati*. The commentary on JB. 1, 49 here stops. The phrases *atha yathānvāhāryapacanas* .. etc., which form a problem in JB. and may

represent later additions, are left out. This *āhitāgnidahanapaṭalaḥ* is concluded with the end of JGS. 2, 4.

In the next *paṭala* Śrīnivāsa again takes up the text of JGS. ed. 2, 4: 29. 17 ff. *sati śarīraṃ luptakeśaṃ nikṛttanakhaṃ citām āropayanti* (JGS. ed. *satīśarīram uptakeśa* ..). The commentary interprets *satīśarīram* (r. *sati śarīra*) as "the body of the good wife": *satīśarīraṃ· pativratāśarīram ity arthaḥ. upariṣṭādvakṣyamāṇanirmanthyena dahanam* (see JGS. ed. 2, 5: 30. 7 *āhitāgneś cet pūrvaṃ jāyā mriyeta tāṃ nirmanthyena dahet*) *tu apativratāyā iti gamyate.* This is not only completely incorrect, it also contradicts the commentator's earlier view that *sati śarīra* should be read (which refers to the *anaṣṭaśarīra*; see above). Is Śrīnivāsa not to be blamed for this stupid contradiction and can we assume that a second hand was at work in this commentary?

The sūtra belongs to a considerably later period than the present section inserted in JB. This appears from the fact that its description of the funeral rites (starting with *sati śarīra* ..) refers to JB. in order to avoid a double treatment. It explicitly condemns some obsolete customs (e.g. the disemboweling) by giving its own, summarized version of the JB. passage in which the details criticized are omitted: *sati śarīra uptakeśaṃ* (JB. *vapanti keśaśmaśrūṇi*) *nikṛttanakhaṃ* (JB. *nakhān nikṛntanti*) [JB. *nirāntraṃ kṛtvā niṣpurīṣaṃ kurvanti* is left out] *prakṣālitaṃ* (omitted in Śrīnivāsa's text; it does not have an equivalent in JB. as *prakṣālya* there is associated with *āntrāṇi*) *citām āropayanti* (JB. 1, 48). The offering of liquid butter in JB. 1, 47 is omitted here, but the sūtra later refers to it. The commentator who inserted the JB. section for the funeral of the *āhitāgni* was left with a simpler, younger and abridged version of the sūtra (with references to the old JB. treatment of this ritual). In his opinion this abridgement only dealt with the funeral of the *āhitāgni*'s *pativratā (satī)* wife, for whom the disemboweling should not be allowed: *tasyāyaṃ purastād apavādaḥ nirāntrakaraṇaniṣpurīṣakaraṇāhutīnāṃ nivṛttyarthaś ca. anyat sarvam āhitāgnivad eva.* The sūtra continues *atra pātrāṇy api cinoti "tasyām enam ādadhati tasya nāsikayoḥ sruvau nidadhyād" ity etenānuvākena*, i.e. it refers to JB. 1, 48 (a chapter which does not contain obsolete practices) in order to abridge its description of the āhitāgni's funeral ceremony. The commentator, however, has it refer to the āhitāgni's wife (a rather odd interpretation especially in view of the *pātracayana*): *atra satīśarīradahane "tasyām" ityādyanuvākavihitaṃ yajñapātranidhānam api āhitāgnivad eva kuryād ity arthaḥ.* Then the sūtra again quotes JB.: *ya evaṃvit syāt sa yadopatāpī syād iti pūrvam eva caturgṛhītaṃ gṛhītvānyaṃ* (r. *anyad*) *yathāsaṃbhavam.* The commentator evidently has not understood this passage (due to his misinterpretation of *satīśarīram*) and places a stop after *pūrvam eva.* The anuvāka *sa yadopatāpī syād* would only refer to transferring the fires in case of expected death and represent an obsolete practice *(pūrvam): sa yadopatāpī syād* (remarkably enough *ya evaṃvit syāt* is rightly omitted) *ityādinā pūrvoktaḥ jīvata eva śmaśānapraveśavidhiḥ pūrvam eva kṛtādiyugeṣv eva nādhunā prākṛtais tathā kartuṃ śakyam ity arthaḥ.* The commentator seems to overlook that this funeral deals with the *āhitāgni*'s

wife in his own (wrong) view and that in the description of the *āhitāgni*'s funeral (inserted from JB.) this custom was mentioned without disapproval. Obviously *pūrvam* should be taken with *caturgṛhītaṃ gṛhītvā*, the action which takes place before the *pātracayana* and for which the sūtra refers to JB. The reference starts with the beginning of this section (by mistake even including the last three words of the preceding section: *ya evaṃvit syāt*) and not with I, 47, which forms a separate chapter only in the present redaction. The sūtra makes the other prescriptions of JB. I, 46-47 optional (*anyad yathāsaṃbhavam*; with the exception of those details such as the shaving of the corpse which have already been treated in the sūtra). Only the offering of butter seems to be compulsory. The commentary interprets *anyam* as *āhitāgnītaram aupāsanāgnimantaṃ samidādhānāgnimantaṃ vā*. The rest of JGS. 2, 4 was already commented upon at the end of the JB. insertion. The Subodhinī now continues with JGS. 2, 5 and has no more interest for us.

So one may conclude that JGS. is much younger than the JB. section on the funeral rites (some customs are rejected) and that the sūtra-like passage in JB. already formed a part of the text when JGS. was composed (JB. is quoted *ya evaṃvit syāt sa yadopatāpī syāt*). The commentary is mediocre (to put it mildly) and may in this section have been written by more than one hand since it contains a serious contradiction and the composition is confused. The commentator who misinterpreted the passage starting with *sati śarīra (satīśarīram)* must also have inserted the present JB. section in the commentary (otherwise there would be no funeral ritual for the āhitāgni in his commentary). The same man may have been responsible for the transposition of JGS. 2, 4 to the end of the commentary (where he could freely make his elaborate insertion).

The position of this comparatively old sūtra-like section in JB. and its origin remain obscure. Oertel, o.c., p. 103 unconvincingly tries to explain it in the context of the brāhmaṇa: "As in ŚB. the funeral rites are incidentally dealt with in the JB. in connection with a possible mortal illness of the sacrificer, his death being considered as one of many disturbances of the sacrifice which call for an expiation *(prāyaścitti)*". This explanation, which only holds good partially in the case of ŚB., does not make sense as far as JB. is concerned. This section obviously is an insertion and its source seems to have been a sūtra. This sūtra may have been a Śāṭyāyana. See Oertel, o.c., p. 106, who rightly observes that quotations from a Śāṭyāyanakam may refer to a sūtra rather than to a brāhmaṇa. On the other hand a sūtra-like quotation from the Śāṭyāyanakam which concerns the funeral ritual is not found in the present JB. section (see Oertel). Perhaps JB. has taken this section with some modifications and abridgements from a lost Śāṭ. sūtra without being entirely identical to that text.

On ritualistic details and their parallels see the notes, which contain many references to Caland's *Bestattungsgebräuche*. Here it may be useful to treat at some length two starting-points for a comparison of the texts which deal with these rites, i.e. the mantras *ayaṃ vai tvad* .. etc. (I, 47)

and the piling of the implements on the corpse (1, 48). On the rite in which these mantras are recited in JB. see n. 12, where it is shown that JB. combines two different ritual actions and that in the parallel texts these mantras are used at the cremation proper and its accompanying āhutis.

In the schematic arrangement of the mantras which is given below the following parallels of JB. (1, 47) figure: TĀ.[1] (6, 1, 4; = BPiS. 1, 8: 13. 3); TĀ.[2] (6, 2, 1; = VS. 35, 22; ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 15; KŚS. 25, 7, 38; GPiS. 1, 3, 13 and 2, 7, 36 reading *tasmāt* instead of *asmāt*); TĀ.[3] (6, 4, 2; = BPiS. 1, 13 and 3, 5); ŚŚS. (4, 14, 36); ĀśvGS. (4, 3, 27; = KauśS. 81, 30). TĀ.[1] is recited after the *upoṣaṇa* (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 62), whereas ŚŚS. accompanies the kindling of the pyre. On *asmāt tvam adhi* .. and the offering with which it is connected see Caland, o.c., p. 63, whose remark "In allen sūtras [i.e. except the Taitt.] geht die spende dem upoṣaṇam voran" is not correct. According to ŚB., KŚS. and GPiS. (2, 7, 36; reading *tasmāt*, but for the rest following ŚB., as also appears from the context) the offering takes place after the *upoṣaṇa*. See also GPiS. 1, 3, 19 *dahanamantreṇa* (referring to 1, 3, 13) *ājyāhutiṃ hutvā* (after the *upoṣaṇa*). The Taitt. use this mantra at the recremation (BPiS. 1, 13; 3, 10, followed by ĀgnGS. and later ritualists) or incidentally (BPiS. 3, 5). These formulas are always connected with the cremation regarded as an offering to Agni. See also JB. 1, 2. They are never recited before the *pātracayana* as in this instance. JB. seems to represent a combination of two sacrifices; the offering at home (with different mantras) and the offering at the *śmaśāna* (using these mantras, but performed at the very moment of cremation). See n. 12.

JB.	*ayaṃ vai tvad asmād asi tvam etad* / (11)
TĀ.[1]	*ayaṃ vai* tvam *asmād* adhi *tvam etad* / (11)
ŚŚS.	*ayaṃ vai tvat* t(u)vam asmād / (8)
JB.	*ayaṃ te yonir asya yonis t(u)vam* // (11)
TĀ.[1]	*ayaṃ* vai tad *asya yonir* asi // (10) [vaiśvānaraḥ]
ŚŚS.	*ayaṃ te yonis t(u)vam asya yoniḥ* // (11)
JB.	*pitā putrāya lokakṛj jātavedo* / (12)
TĀ.[1]	putraḥ pitre *lokakṛj jātavedo* / (11)
ŚŚS.	[*jātavedo*]
JB.	*nayā hy (hi) enaṃ sukṛtāṃ yatra lokaḥ* // (12)
TĀ.[1]	vahemaṃ (vaha imaṃ) *sukṛtāṃ yatra* lokāḥ // (11)
ŚŚS	vahasvainaṃ *sukṛtāṃ yatra lokaḥ* // (11)
JB.	*asmād vai tvam ajāyathā* / eṣa *tvaj* jāyatāṃ svāhā //
ĀśvGS.	*asmād vai tvam ajāyathā* / *ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām* //
TĀ.[2]	*asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si* / tvad ayaṃ jāyatāṃ punaḥ //
TĀ.[3]	*asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si* / *ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām* //
ŚŚS.	ayaṃ vai tvām ajanayad / *ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām* //

Conclusions:

a) Oertel's division of the first two pādas, followed by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra (see also their "Studies in the JB."), is not correct. The

metre consists of four pādas of eleven or twelve syllables (triṣṭubh/jagatī) and two pādas of eight syllables. By pronouncing *tuvad* and *tuvam* in the first, and *tvam* in the second pāda one may obtain two pādas of 11 respectively 12 syllables in Oertel's division. The corrupt TĀ. parallel, however, does not allow this punctuation since *vai* is scarcely possible in third position. See also the mantras recited at the agnyādhāna TB. 1, 2, 1, 20 *ahaṃ tvad asmi mad asi tvam etad* / (11) *mamāsi yonis tava yonir asmi* / (11) *mamaiva san vaha havyāny* (= *i*) *agne* / (11) *putraḥ pitre lokakṛj jātavedaḥ* // (11). Cf. TB. 2, 5, 8, 7; 3, 7, 7, 10; ĀpŚS. 5, 16, 1 (a.o.). In these mantras *etad* cannot but be taken with the first pāda. Its meaning is quite clear there. The mantra is recited just after the establishment of the fire and *etad* consequently means "now" or "here". See Caland's translation of ĀpŚS. 5, 16, 1 ".. du bist hier aus mir (hervorgekommen)". The verse is also recited in other rites where the relationship of sacrificer and fire plays a role. In the present funeral mantras — probably adaptations of the *agnyādhāna* mantras — *etad* is rather superfluous and therefore has been omitted by ŚŚS. Oertel as well as Śrīnivāsa do not understand *etad* in this context and explain it as a causal adverb: *asmād āhitāgneḥ pituḥ araṇyāḥ patnyās tvaṃ prādurbhūto 'si yataḥ tataḥ ayaṃ te yoniḥ* .. (Oertel translates the mantra: "He verily is of thee, of him thou art; thus he is thy womb ..").

b) In the triṣṭubh pādas JB. and TĀ. are, in general, similar, but in some points the parallelism with ŚŚS. is more striking. TĀ.[1] contains some corruptions. Presumably the original reading of TĀ. was also *ayaṃ te yoniḥ* (cf. ṚV. 3, 29, 10 *ayaṃ te yonir ṛtviyo* ..; again influence from the *agnyādhāna*) which with *asya yonir asi* forms a triṣṭubh pāda rather than *ayaṃ vai tad* (r. *tvad*) which should be transferred to the first pāda (for *ayaṃ vai tvam*; see also Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 63, n. 237).

c) Together the third and fourth pāda of TĀ.[1] amount to 25 syllables. In the triṣṭubh scheme *vaiśvānaraḥ* is superfluous as appears from TB. 1, 2, 1, 20 *putraḥ pitre lokakṛj jātavedas* (11 syllables). Probably the fourth pāda (unless *vaha imam* is pronounced) is short of one or two syllables because it has been taken from the preceding mantra, ../ *yās te śivās tanuvo jātaveda* / *tābhir vahemaṃ sukṛtāṃ yatra lokāḥ* //, in which the metre is faultless. Or has the original reading been *vahāsy enam*? Cf. TB. 3, 7, 6, 9; ĀpŚS. 4, 7, 2 *vahāsi mā sukṛtāṃ yatra lokāḥ* (11) (= KS. 31, 14 *vahāṃsi sā sukṛtām* ..; see Bloomfield-Edgerton, *Vedic Variants* II, p. 156 and 407). In that case *nayāhy* (to be read *nayā hy* according to "Studies in the JB." — a corruption of *nayāsy* (*Vedic Variants* II, p. 153 and 375) — may be a variant of *vahāsy*. If the reading of the critical edition is retained, *nayā* with lengthened *a* would imply that this mantra is old. For *hi* with imperative see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 522; for the lengthening before two consonants of which the second is *y* or *v* see Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* I, p. 311. At any rate the JB. mantra cannot be derived from the transmitted TĀ.[1] version, which seems to consist of three pādas of 11 syllables (after correction of the second; the third starts with *vaiśvānaraḥ*) and two of 8 syllables:

jātavedo vaha imaṃ | sukṛtaaṃ yatra lokāḥ ||. The four pādas of 11/12 syllables in JB. seem to be more original. They may even have been present in the TĀ. version (as appears from the outline). One may assume that *pitā putrāya* forms an adaptation of *putraḥ pitre* (TB. 1, 2, 1, 20) and that JB. has taken these recasted agnyādhāna mantras from a Taittirīya source.

d) By omitting some words ŚŚS. has disturbed the 11/12 syllabic composition of the first pādas. The dropping of *etad* (see above) turned the first pāda into an 8 syllabic one. The second pāda could not be changed into an 8 syllabic one without detracting from the contents (the break and cadence *t(u)vam asya yoniḥ* even looks more regular than in the other versions); the third pāda was omitted, the fourth changed into two 8 syllabic ones by taking *jātavedo* with *vahemam*, which was replaced by *vahasvainam* for metrical reasons: *jātavedo vahasvainaṃ | sukṛtāṃ* (= *aaṃ*) *yatra lokaḥ*.

e) JB. and ŚŚS. have connected the mantras *ayaṃ vai tvad* .. and *asmāt tvam adhi* (or its variants) .., which were used by different schools or on different occasions. Both texts have the correct readings *ayaṃ vai tvad* and *ayaṃ te yoniḥ* and read *lokaḥ* (instead of TĀ. *lokāḥ*). The version of ŚŚS. which is in many respects secondary may be (at least partly) based on JB.

f) In the second (8 syllabic) mantra several variants occur. See *Vedic Variants*, passim. The JB. version of the second pāda in which *svāhā* has to be counted as part of the 8 syllabic pāda (replacing *adhi* or *punaḥ*) does not seem to be original.

Śrīnivāsa comments on the mantras as follows: *he agne ayaṃ vai tvat ayam āhitāgniḥ tvat tvatsakāśād vai prādurbhūtaḥ agner āpaḥ adbhyaḥ pṛthivī pūrvyā* (r. *pṛthivyāḥ*) *oṣadhayaḥ oṣadhībhya annam annāt puruṣa iti śrūyate asmād āhitāgneḥ pituḥ araṇyāḥ patnyās tvaṃ prādurbhūto 'si yataḥ tataḥ ayaṃ te yoniś ca tvam iti yuvāṃ pitāputrau he jātavedaḥ pitā putre* (r. *pitre*) *putrāya putraḥ iti prathamācaturthyor vyatyayaḥ yatra sukṛtāṃ lokaḥ tatrainaṃ nayāhi naya asmād vai ajāyathāḥ iyaṃtaṃ kālam asya gṛhe etad(a)dattājyahavissomādibhir avardhayathāḥ tathā eṣa tvatsakāśāt jāyatāṃ yajñabhujām anyatamo bhūtvā yajñabhāgāmṛtabrahmānanādādibhir vardhatām* (the whole text is reproduced as found in Caland's transcript). First it may be observed that commenting on verses is rather unusual. It may indicate that this commentary is rather young and not one of the most outstanding. The latter fact seems to be confirmed by its explanation of the mantras. The water doctrine (on which see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B; for the present version compare TU. 2, 1) evidently does not form the correct explanation of *ayaṃ vai tvad*. The sacrificer or rather his life (breath) is produced out of the fire in accordance with the agnyādhāna theory of JB. 1, 1. The fires are his *prāṇāḥ*. Consequently one can say that he is produced by (or dependent on) the fire which he has actually produced himself. The father is his own son. Therefore *putraḥ pitre* is equal to *pitā putrāya*. The commentator tries to interpret the second mantra *(asmād vai tvam ..)* — a remote variant of the first — as different from the first.

For the piling of the sacrificial implements *(pātracayanam)* see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 49 ff. and the tables drawn up by Oertel, o.c., p. 107 ff., which show some similarities and differences between the parallels without elucidating the relation between the texts. The only conclusion drawn by Oertel (p. 111) that "the differences between the JB and the younger Sāmantexts are noteworthy", is rather meagre for an outline covering four printed pages. From a methodological point of view his survey is not satisfactory since it draws the attention only to incidental (and consequently perhaps accidental) similarities, but not to the agreements of pātracayanas as a totality. A ritualistic school does not borrow the placing of a single, particular implement on a particular part of the body, but adopts (or is influenced by) the complete pātracayanam of another school. Moreover the one school seems to be influenced by a (passage from a) text (written or orally transmitted) of another school, rather than by the actual observance of particular customs and ritualistic details. This form of borrowing involves the risk of making rather automatic mistakes. Therefore the order of the arrangement of the implements, the order of the parts of the body, the number of the implements, etc. should be marked in order to give an impression of the similarities between complete pātracayanam passages. The outline drawn up below includes the most important passages: JB. (1, 48); LŚS. (8, 8, 17 ff.; cf. DŚS. 23, 4, 16 ff. and GPiS. 2, 7, 12 ff.); ŚB. (12, 5, 2, 17; cf. KŚS. 25, 7, 21 ff.); ŚŚS. (4, 14, 18 ff.); ĀśvGS. (4, 3, 2 ff.); KauśS. (81, 4 ff.); BPiS. (1, 5 f.). The secondary BPiS., the younger Taitt., VaiGS., ĀgnGS. and MŚS. will be discussed later. The implements are left untranslated. By *camasaḥ* and *pātrī* the several implements placed on (or at) the head and on the abdomen are denoted: *samoptadhānaḥ camasaḥ* (LŚS.); *samavattadhānaḥ camasaḥ* (ĀśvGS., on the abdomen, but according to GPiS. on the head!); *praṇītā-praṇayanaḥ camasaḥ* (ŚB.; BPiS.; on left ear ŚŚS.); *camasaḥ iḍopahavanaḥ* (*iḍopavahanam* as read by Oertel and the crit. ed. is wrong; see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10) (JB.); *iḍācamasaḥ* (KauśS.); *pātrī* (LŚS.; ĀśvGS.; KauśS.); *pātrī samavattadhānī* (JB.; ŚB.; *saṃvartadhānīm* in JB. crit. ed. has to be emended; the correct reading in Oertel's edition); *samavattadhānī* (ŚŚS.); *dārupātrī* (BPiS.). The *puroḍāśam* placed on the chest in KauśS. seems to be the *puroḍāśapātrī* (Caland, o.c., p. 50) and can be explained as a *pātrī* in our outline. This outline is mainly based on the arrangement of ŚB., which is followed by most texts and which may represent one of the oldest pātracayanas.

Implements	*JB*	*LŚS*	*ŚB*	*ŚŚS*	*ĀśvGS*	*KauśS*	*BPiS*	Parts of body
juhū	2	5	*1*	1	1	1	8	Right hand
upabhṛt	3	6	*2*	2	2	2	9	Left hand
dhruvā	4	7	*3*	3	5	3	10	Chest (*KauśS* Throat)
agnihotrahavanī	5	4	*4*	4	4	4	1	Mouth (*ŚŚS* Throat; *ĀśvGS* Left side)

Implements	*JB*	*LŚS*	*ŚB*	*ŚŚS*	*ĀśvGS*	*KauśS*	*BPiS*	Parts of body
sruvaḥ (*-au*)	1	3	5	5	8	5	2	Nostrils
prāśitraharaṇam (*-e*)	7	2	6	6	9	6	4	Ears (*ŚŚS* Right ear; *LŚS*, *KauśS* Forehead)
camasaḥ	6	1	7	7	10	7	7	Head (*ŚŚS* Left ear; *ĀśvGS* Abdomen)
kapalāni	—	1	—	8	6	—	5	Head
grāvāṇaḥ	—	—	—	9	7	—	—	Teeth
pātrī	8	8	9	10	10	11/8	14	Abdomen (*KauśS* 8 Chest)
dṛṣadupale	9	10	—	—	—	—	21	Scrotum (*LŚS* Between thighs)
śamyā	10	10	10	—	11	—	22	Penis (*ĀśvGS* Pudenda; *LŚS* Between thighs)
vṛṣāravaḥ (*-au*)	—	—	11	—	—	—	22	Penis / Scrotum (*BPiS* / *ŚB*)
kṛṣṇājinam	11	9	—	13	—	—	—	Pudenda (*ŚŚS* Left side)
araṇī	—	—	—	14	12	—	10	Pudenda (*ĀśvGS* Loins; *BPiS* Chest)
sphyaḥ	12	—	12	12	3	9	13	Back (*ŚŚS*, *ĀśvGS*, *KauśS* Right side; *ŚB* Right hand)
upaveṣaḥ	—	—	—	—	—	10	—	Left side
musalam (*-e*)	13	12	—	—	—	—	—	Both sides / Along thighs (*JB* / *LŚS*)
ulūkhalam	14	11	—	—	—	—	—	Feet / To the right of the right upper leg (*JB* / *LŚS*)
ulūkhalamusale	—	—	11	15	13	12	20	Loins / Knees / Lower legs / Scrotum (*ŚŚS*, *BPiS* / *ŚŚS*, *KauśS* / *ĀśvGS*/ *ŚB*)
śūrpam (*-e*)	13	13	8	—	14	14	15	Both sides / Feet (*JB*, *ŚB*, *BPiS* / *LŚS*, *ĀśvGS*, *KauśS*)
śūrpaśakaṭe	—	—	—	16	—	—	—	Feet

Conclusions:

a) The corpse is covered from the head to the feet. LŚS. and BPiS. start with the head and its openings, whereas in the other texts the hands and the chest come first. JB. seems to have disturbed the regular order by starting with the nostrils (more or less in accordance with LŚS.) and thereafter shifting to the order of the other texts. LŚS. has reversed the usual order mouth, nostrils, ears (forehead), (top of the) head. It is remarkable that the teeth, only occurring in ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., are mentioned after the head in both texts which have a rather different order in the remaining items. The position of the teeth (corresponding to the mouth of the other texts) in ĀśvGS., where the (top of the) head precedes the openings of the head, seems to be more original. The order of JB. 6 and 7 (head and ears, one of the openings of the head) may be secondary. The other texts make the orifices precede the (top of the) head. Influence from LŚS.?

b) Not only the order of the parts of the body is rather uniform, but also the order of the implements. Sometimes the implements retain the original order, whereas the parts of the body change place. KauśS., for instance, places the *dhruvā* in its usual 3d position on the throat instead of the chest. Now this chest in position 8 receives a *pātrī (puroḍāśam = puroḍāśapātrī)* — the usual 8th item of the implements (JB.; LŚS.; 10th in ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., where, however, it would be 8th without the later additions and transpositions). ŚŚS. retains *agnihotrahavanī* as 4th, but places it on the throat instead of the mouth, which is left out and secondarily replaced by the teeth (9). ĀśvGS. puts the same spoon on the left side. It is striking that the two sides, moved from the 12th and 13th place [thus in ŚŚS.; in KauśS. they are 9th and 10th], have retained for the right one the *sphyaḥ* (JB. and ŚB. 12; BPiS. 13); for the left side the order of the implements prevailed and the *agnihotrahavanī* (4th in most parallels) was laid down on the 4th position. Several other instances may be given where we find that the utensils preserve the original order whereas their position on the corpse changed. Most of them can be read from the table. Observe that ŚŚS. *praṇītāpraṇayanaḥ* (sc. *camasaḥ*) on the left ear (7) corresponds to *camasaḥ praṇītāpraṇayaḥ* (respectively *praṇ. cam.*) on (at) the head in ŚB. and BPiS. in 7th position (in spite of the fact that the latter text, at many points, has a different order of distribution). Compare also KauśS. *iḍācamasaḥ* (7). ĀśvGS. also does not place the *camasaḥ* (i.c. *samavattadhānaḥ*) on the head (but on the abdomen). It retains, however, the fixed order *sruvaḥ, prāśitraharaṇam, camasaḥ*. Perhaps ĀśvGS. *pātrīṃ samavattadhānaṃ ca camasam* (10) represents a combination of *pātrīm* (LŚS.; cf. ŚB., JB. *pātrīṃ samavattadhānīm*), the original implement on the abdomen, and *samavattadhānaṃ camasam* (DŚS.; cf. LŚS. *samoptadhānaṃ ca camasam*), the implement following (or preceding) *prāśitraharaṇam* in the parallels.

c) Most of the differences can be explained as later developments due to rearrangement or insertion of new items. Often these developments are traceable because the order of the piling of the implements was fre-

quently left unchanged. One common source, not necessarily to be found among the transmitted texts, is probable. One of the oldest pātracayanas is found in ŚB. Like several sūtras JB. (i.e. this sūtra-like insertion) seems to follow this brāhmaṇa. The first seven items agree almost completely (except for the transpositions 5/1 and 7/6, which may be due to LŚS.). ŚB. 8 *śūrpe* (on both sides, as in JB.) was transferred to the 13th position in JB., undoubtedly under influence of LŚS., where the *śūrpam* is laid at or on the feet and consequently the 13th and last position is quite normal. JB. 8 now corresponds to ŚB. 9; JB. 9 has been taken from LŚS.; JB. 10 again corresponds to ŚB. 10 (and to some extent to LŚS. 10); JB. 11 has no relation to ŚB., but agrees with LŚS.; JB. 12 more or less corresponds to ŚB. 12; JB. 13 and 14 come from LŚS. One may conclude that the JB. *pātracayanam* derives from ŚB., but was rearranged under influence of the Sāmavedic sūtra LŚS. Consequently Oertel's conclusion (o.c., p. 111) that the "differences between the JB. and the other younger Sāmantexts are noteworthy" has to be corrected. First the similarities are noteworthy as well, as appears from the outline, in which they become more evident than in his own survey. Secondly Oertel's expression "younger Sāmantexts" seems to be only partially correct. GPiS. (here almost identical to DŚS.) is undoubtedly late (Caland, *Pitṛmedhasūtras*, p. XXII). DŚS. has been proved to be an adaptation of LŚS. by A. Parpola, *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyaṇa and their commentaries*, I: 1 (thesis Helsinki 1968), p. 33 ff., who also demonstrates that DŚS. and the Rāṇāyanīya school have been influenced by JB. and the Jaiminīyas (o.c., p. 41). LŚS. is younger than JŚS. (o.c., p. 95 f.; cf. also Parpola, "On the Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra and Its Annexes", *Orientalia Suecana* 16, 1967, p. 201 f.) and has drawn from JB. (o.c., p. 91; Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 41 ff.). Are we, however, to assume that the whole JB. is older than LŚS.? The brāhmaṇa by no means should be regarded as a complete unity. The agnihotra section (1, 1-65) seems to form a later addition and the sūtra-like passage on the funeral ritual looks like an insertion in that (late) section. So it may be assumed that the *pātracayanam* of JB. was influenced by LŚS. With regard to the most striking proof of this assumption, the position of *śūrpe* (see above), one may observe that "On both sides" (the place where the *śūrpe* are laid according to JB. and ŚB., but which is not mentioned in the *pātracayanam* of LŚS.) was inserted in DŚS. and GPiS. in 7th position. Obviously *pārśvayoḥ sphyopaveṣau* is an insertion since it separates *tathā vṛkyau* (LŚS. *vṛkkau*) *yathāsvam* [incorrectly translated by *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1081 which does not mention the kidneys] from *dakṣiṇe* and *savye pāṇau*, the two spots on which the kidneys should be placed according to all the parallel texts. At one point JB. disagrees with ŚB. as well as with LŚS. The remaining implements are laid *upari*, in all other texts between the thighs. Instead of *pariśiṣṭāni* (JB.) or *anyāni* (ŚB.) *pātrāṇi* LŚS. has *yac ca nādekṣyāmaḥ*. Caland's note on GPiS. 2, 7, 26, in which he regards the correction *adikṣāma* as obvious and rejects the possibility of a future tense, is untenable. The future *ādekṣyamaḥ* (see also *The Pitṛmedhasūtras, Appendix*, p. 132) is undoubtedly correct

since "between the thighs" does not (as in the parallel passages) form the conclusion of the piling in LŚS.

d) On the other texts and their interrelationship some short remarks. The Ṛgvedic sūtras ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., which agree with each other in many respects, seem to be based on ŚB. There are some agreements with LŚS. and DŚS. *(pātrī; samavattadhānaḥ camasaḥ; kapalāni; śūrpam, śakaṭaśūrpe)*. Has ŚŚS. (4, 5, 6, 7, 8) borrowed from LŚS. (4, 3, 2, 1, 1)? Perhaps the Ṛgvedic sūtras could shift the *camasaḥ* to another position by introducing the *kapalāni* on the head. On the relation between ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS. V. M. Apte, *Non-Ṛgvedic Mantras rubricated in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra* (= *N.I.A.* 3, 1940-41), p. 60 observes that the ĀśvGS. passage is based on ŚŚS. On the one hand the position of the teeth in ĀśvGS. (before the nostrils and ears and therefore replacing the mouth) seems to be more original than in ŚŚS., where "teeth" after "head" is odd. On the other hand ĀśvGS. "left side" (4) betrays a rather careless transposition and ŚŚS, as a totality makes a more original impression (i.e. it is closer to the ŚB. original). Perhaps later on the older ŚŚS. adopted some items such as the *grāvāṇaḥ* on the teeth from ĀśvGS. A considerable extension of this piling is to be seen in BPiS., which may be younger than the parallels of the outline. On the whole it follows ŚB., but some striking similarities with JB. *(sphyaḥ; dṛṣadupale)* may be noticed. KauśS. agrees with ŚŚS. in some items; the inclusion of "throat" (third instead of fourth); *ulūkhalamusale; sphyaḥ; śakaṭam* (cf. ŚŚS. *śūrpaśakaṭe*); *śūrpaśakaṭe* placed on or at the feet (whereas KauśS. places only the *śūrpam* there).Has ŚŚS. 16 combined KauśS. 13 and 14? KauśS. also agrees with LŚS. / DŚS.: *prāśitraharaṇam; pātrī; upaveṣaḥ* (DŚS. *sphyopaveṣau* "on both sides"); *śakaṭam* (DŚS. *śakaṭaśūrpe*). At least the youngest of the two Sāmavedic sūtras seems to be influenced by KauśS. (especially in the case of the *sphyopaveṣau*, where DŚS. differs from LŚS.). Unfortunately the texts of the Kaṭhas concerning the pātracayanam seem to be incomplete (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 53, n. 192). In the gṛhyapañcikā ms. B^1 fol. 114 a ff., to which Caland refers in *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IX, a very short *cayanam* (apparently independent from ŚB.) is given in which the *dṛṣadau* are placed at the scrotum (cf. JB. *dṛṣadupale*), the *ulūkhalamusale* on the penis, the *kapalāni* and the *upayāmaḥ* on or at the head.

There are other texts dealing with the *pātracayanam* such as the secondary BPiS. and the younger Taittirīyas which have not been included in the table above. Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IV f. observes on this secondary BPiS. (i.e. BPiS. 2-3): ". . weicht dieser kalpa merkwürdigerweise in einem einzelfalle vom älteren Baudhāyana ab und schliesst sich den jüngeren Taittirīyaschulen an, nämlich bei der schichtung der opfergeräte". Miss Raabe, o.c., p. XVII points at the similarity of BPiS. 3, 3 and HirPiS. 1, 5 f., but only enumerates the differences without explaining the relation between the two passages. As to the "secondary" BPiS. as a totality she hesitatingly draws the conclusion that perhaps it may be even older than HirPiS. (p. XIX). The relationship can be

established with much more accuracy if, for example, corresponding passages such as the pātracayanam are compared in a more systematic way. Referring for brevity's sake to the above table I shall mention only the significant points. The most important one is the placement of the *ulūkhalamusale* on the thighs in BPiS.[1] (20) and BPiS.[2] (8); on the jaws in HirPiS. (8). In the order of distribution "thighs" (8) between "ears" (7) and "teeth" (9) is obviously out of place in BPiS.[2] The only possible explanation is that HirPiS., or rather its source BhārPiS., has introduced the jaws in this piling and has placed the *ulūkhalamusale* on these jaws, which required two implements and, moreover, resemble the mortar and pestle because of their function (the two sets of eating teeth; in their original position the two implements had a function in sexual symbolism). BPiS.[2] adopting the piling of BhārPiS. (or the identical HirPiS. and ĀpPiS.), but still under influence of BPiS.[1], corrected *ulūkhalamusale* "jaws" into *ulūkhalamusale* "thighs" without changing the order. One can even guess why BhārPiS. has introduced the jaws. They had to facilitate the insertion of the teeth, not mentioned by BPiS.[1] and taken from ĀśvGS. / ŚŚS. In those Ṛgvedic sūtras the teeth formed the substitute of "mouth". In BhārPiS., which has retained "mouth" (4), "teeth" is superfluous in the series of orifices of the head and had to be set apart by means of "jaws". The general impression created by BhārPiS. is that of a remodeling of BPiS.[1] in which some pilings have been left out and others added. BPiS.[2], however, seems to have added some items to the *pātracayanam* of BhārPiS., but to have followed BPiS.[1] more closely. BhārPiS. starts the piling with the right hand etc. in accordance with most texts of the table. BPiS.[1] dealing with the piling in two chapters (5 and 6) ends ch. 5 shortly after the beginning of the *cayanam* with a pratīka *(imam agne camasam)* and opens the next chapter with the full quotation (cf. the end of ch. 1; 4; 6; 8; 11; 15). BhārPiS. also makes an incision in the *pātracayanam* passage (after *dhruvām araṇī ca*), but neither the contents nor the occurrence of a quotation give rise to the beginning of a new chapter. The order of the piling and the changes brought about in this order by the Taittirīyas form the criterion. BPiS.[1] differs from the other, older passages dealing with the *cayanam* in starting its piling with the mouth (4th in the parallels of the outline). The usual first item, the *juhū* on the right hand, now occupies the 8th position, but strangely enough opens a new chapter (after the full quotation belonging to the pratīka of the preceding chapter). BhārPiS. on the other hand begins with the right hand, but starts a new chapter with the placing of the *agnihotrahavanī* on the mouth, i.e. the opening of the *pātracayanam* in BPiS.[1] So BhārPiS. has directly taken its *pātracayanam* from BPiS.[1] and adapted its order to the usual one. BPiS.[2] just as BPiS.[1] begins with the mouth instead of the right hand, but does not start a new chapter with the right hand. The pratīka *imam agne camasam* here concludes the chapter as well as the whole piling (except for some prescriptions on the rest of the implements). This transference to the end of the *cayanam* (where the next chapter, as usual in Baudhāyana, starts with the full quotation) is undoubtedly adopted

from BhārPiS., where the pratīka occurs in the same position. BhārPiS. (21/22) has combined BPiS¹. *śirastaḥ praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ camasaṃ nidadhātīmam agne camasam* (7) with *śirasta upasādanīyaṃ kūrcaṃ nidadhāti* (23) in *śirasta upasādanīyam iḍāpātraṃ cemam agne camasam iti madhye camasam*. For *iḍāpātram* compare JB. *iḷopahavanaḥ* (6) and KauśS. *iḍācamasaḥ* (7) similarly placed on or at the head. It is doubtful if *madhye* means "on the waist" as Oertel, o.c., p. 108 translates it. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 53, n. 200 quoting Gopālayajvan's pitṛmedhasūtrabhāṣya: *camaso 'tra praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ śiraso madhye etayarcā nidadhyāt*. See also Caland's translation of ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 21: .."mitten (auf das Haupt)". On the other hand "at the feet", "at the head" and "in/on the middle" (Kashikar translates BhārPiS. 1, 6, 19 "in the middle") form an excellent, systematical conclusion of the piling. BPiS². (ed. Raabe) reads *śirasta upasādanīyaṃ vedam śikhāyām iḍāpātraṃ ca praṇītāpraṇayanam itīmam agne camasam. imam agne* (..) *iti camasam*, hardly a tenable text with *iti* preceding and following the *pratīka* and *sakala* quotation, and *ca* lacking after *praṇītāpraṇayanam*. Two mss. (M; G) have *śikhāyām praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ cedāpātraṃ cemam agne* ... The text of BPiS². is evidently corrupt. For practical reasons this accumulation of implements on the hairtuft *(śikhāyām)* is scarcely possible. Obviously *vedaṃ śikhāyām* should (as in BhārPiS.) precede *śirasta upasādanīyam*. Moreover the text of BPiS². seems to have been corrupted under influence of BPiS¹. (from which the *sakala* quotation missing in BhārPiS. also has been adopted). The two versions of the mss. betray the traces of this double influence:

BPiS¹.			*praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ*	
BPiS². (a)	*upasādanīyam* (..)	*iḍāpātraṃ ca*	*praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ*	
BPiS². (b)	*upasādanīyam* (..)		*praṇītāpraṇayanaṃ*	
BhārPiS.	*upasādanīyam*			
BPiS¹.	*camasaṃ nidadhāt īmam agne* ..		*iti*	
BPiS².		*it īmam agne* ..	*iti*	*camasam*
BPiS². (b)	*cedāpātraṃ*	*cemam agne* ..	*iti*	*camasam*
BhārPiS.	*iḍāpātraṃ*	*cemam agne* ..	*iti madhye*	*camasam*

Presumably *itīmam* forms a corrupt remnant of *nidadhātīmam*.

Miss Raabe's remark, o.c., p. 19 that the *piṣṭasaṃyavanī* and the *piṣṭodvapanī* are different utensils because the first is placed on the abdomen in BPiS². and BhārPiS., but the latter on the left shoulder in BPiS¹., is not convincing. BhārPiS. leaving out the shoulders puts the mentioned *piṣṭapātrī* (BPiS¹. 12) on the abdomen (*udare*, 12). The *dārupātrī* on the abdomen (*udare*, 14) in BPiS¹. was replaced by BhārPiS., but reintroduced by BPiS². (14) and put *jaṭhare* (almost synonymous with *udare*).

BPiS¹. *anvāhāryasthālī* + *carusthālī* (*śroṇyoḥ*, 18) and *agnihotrasthālī* + *ājyasthālī* (*pādayoḥ*, 19) have been mixed up by the younger Taittirīyas, *agnihotra-* and *anvāhāryasthālī* being placed on the feet (*pratiṣṭhayoḥ*, BhārPiS. 18; BPiS². 19). The substitute of *śroṇyoḥ* (dual), *nābhyam* (sing.), received one of the remaining *sthālīs*, the *ājyasthālī*. Perhaps this

analysis has to be corrected if our interpretation of *pratiṣṭhayoḥ* "on the two feet" (cf. *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1044 translation of BPiS².; Kashikar, BhārPiS. 1, 6, 15 "on the feet"; Caland, ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 21: "auf die Fusssohlen") is wrong. The Āgniveśya and Vaikhānasa gṛhyasūtras obviously have interpreted *pratiṣṭhayoḥ* as "on the twofold bottom by which sitting people are supported". Corresponding to BhārPiS. (18) and BPiS². (19) *agnihotra-* + *anvāhāryasthālī* : *pratiṣṭhayoḥ*, ĀgnGS. 3, 4, 2 and VaiGS. 5, 4 have *agnihotra-* + *anvāhāryasthālī* (VaiGS. corrupt *anvāhāryapacanaḥ*) : *pṛṣṭhayoḥ* (19/16) "on the buttocks". If this is not a wrong reinterpretation, *pratiṣṭhayoḥ* may be equivalent to *śroṇyoḥ* meaning "on the buttocks" rather than "on the thighs" (Oertel, o.c., p. 108) or "on the hips" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 1047).

The mentioned sūtras, placing *ulūkhalamusale* on the jaws and omitting *dārupātrī* (placed *jaṭhare*) and the later added implements *pṛṣadājyagrahaṇī*, *erakaḥ* and *āśvinakapāle*, follow the younger Taitt. and not BPiS²., at least in the first part of the *pātracayanam*, in which they agree almost completely with each other and with BhārPiS. In the second part the order of the distribution shows several differences and ĀgnGS. agrees with BPiS². rather than with BhārPiS. See the following table:

Implements	*BhārPiS*	*BPiS²*	*ĀgnGS*	*VaiGS*	Parts of body
ājyasthālī	13	13	12	6	Navel (*VaiGS* Throat)
śūrpam (-e)	14	15	15	13	Both sides
saṃnāyyakumbhyau (-bham)	15	16	16	14	Groins (*ĀgnGS* Nose)
dṛṣadupale	16	17	17	15	Scrotum
vṛṣāravam ; śamyā	17	18	18	—	Penis
agnihotra- + *anvāhāryasthālī*	18	19	19	16	*pratiṣṭhayoḥ (ĀgnGS, VaiGS pṛṣṭhayoḥ)*
upāvaharaṇīyaḥ (kūrcaḥ)	19	20	13	17	*pattaḥ (VaiGS pādayoḥ)*
vedaḥ (kūrcaḥ)	20	22	20	18	hairtuft
upasādanīyaḥ (kūrcaḥ)	21	21	14	19	*śirastaḥ (VaiGS śirasthāne)*
iḍāpātram	21	22	20	19	*śirastaḥ (BPiS², ĀgnGS* hairtuft)
praṇītāpraṇayanaḥ	—	22	—	—	hairtuft
camasaḥ	22	—	—	—	*madhye*

That ĀgnGS. follows BPiS². as well as BhārPiS. is not surprising. The whole context of ĀgnGS. 3, 4 sometimes verbally agrees with BPiS².,

and 3, 5 is almost identical to the *dahanakalpa* of BPiS[1]. An extensive study of the formation of BPiS[2]. and its relation with the pitṛmedha passage of ĀgnGS. might be interesting. Here it may suffice to say that Caland's remark, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IV: "Ich halte es für möglich, dass dieser dahanakalpa (i.e. in the secondary BPiS.) ursprünglich für eine andere, den Baudhāyanīyas eng verwandte schule gegolten hat und dass er schon früh dem corpus des Baudhāyana einverleibt worden ist" should not induce us to take ĀgnGS. as the source of BPiS.[2] The *pātracayanam* is contrary to such an assumption. The secondary character of ĀgnGS. appears also in the piling of 3, 5 (the section which copies BPiS.[1]), where the *cayanam* of BPiS.[1] has been influenced by the younger Taittirīyas: insertion of *ulūkhalamusale* on the jaws; *agnihotra-* + *anvāhāryasthālī* at the feet (*pādayoḥ*; cf. BhārPiS./BPiS.[2] *pratiṣṭhayoḥ*, but also ĀgnGS. 3, 4 *pṛṣṭhayoḥ*). The late VaiGS. corresponds to the younger Taittirīyas BhārPiS. and ĀgnGS., but not to BPiS.[2]

To conclude this long excursion a few words may be added on the Mānavas (MŚS. 8, 19; ed. J. M. van Gelder, New Delhi 1961), on whose text see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. VIII: "Auch diesen text halte ich nicht für sehr alt". Indeed the section on the funeral ritual and especially the *pātracayanam* are rather late. The latter seems to be influenced by BPiS.[1] (inclusion of the shoulders; the two *sāṃnāyya* pots *kukṣyoḥ*; *ulūkhalamusale* placed *ūrvoḥ*; *vakṣasi* as duplication of *urasi* is hardly tenable and because of its position must be explained as being derived from *vaṅkṣṇayoḥ* by way of *vakṣaṇāyām*?) and by the SV. sūtras and KauśS. (*prāśitaharaṇam* on the forehead; *sphyopaveṣau* on both sides; *śakaṭam* at the feet). At the head MŚS. places *kapālāni*, *ājyadhānī* and *vedaḥ* (7), a combination of the implements laid on and at the head and on the hairtuft by the older texts. Interesting is *sahiraṇyaśakalam puroḍāśam* on the mouth *(āsye)* (according to Caland, o.c., p. 50 *śroṇyoḥ*). The occurrence of *āsye* (8) beside *mukhe* (4) has induced the translator, miss van Gelder (*The Mānava Śrautasūtra*, New Delhi 1963) to take the first as mouth and the latter as face. Perhaps this may be correct since this is obviously a late development of the *pātracayanam*. Originally, however, *mukhe* meant "on the mouth" (the first opening of the head mentioned in the oldest pilings). Second stage: the mouth is replaced by the teeth as the first opening and mentioned after the head (ĀśvGS.). Third stage: the occurrence of the teeth after the head, but not as the first opening, and the insertion of the throat in 4th position (ŚŚS.). Fourth stage: the occurrence of the teeth after the head and the jaws, and the reintroduction of the mouth (4) as first opening of the head (BhārPis.). Last stage: *mukhe* (4) as first opening (van Gelder: "face") and *āsye* occurring after the head (cf. ŚŚS. "teeth" replacing "mouth") (MŚS.). For *puroḍāśam* on the mouth (8) compare KauśS., where it is placed on the chest (8!!!).

As to this sūtra-like insertion as a totality I would finally call attention to the fact that this Sāmavedic śrauta text is completely silent on the Sāmans to be sung at the cremation. They are mentioned in the gṛhya sūtra. Does this imply that the insertion has been adopted from a non-

Sāmavedic source? The gṛhyasūtra passage cannot have been known to the present section.

46 (end). As soon as[1] he (the sacrificer) may have fallen ill, he should say: "Churn my fire here", where he may have discovered a level ground offering a suitable spot.[2] He might recover again.[3]

If this (transference of the fires) has not taken place,[4] they should, if he were to depart this world, take him (to that spot).

Having thrown the two fires (sc. the gārhapatya and āhavanīya) into two separate pots they should seize[5] a firebrand from the anvāhāryapacana. They should take the sacrificial implements, clarified butter, water (for cleansing the corpse), pieces of wood (for the pyre), the *anustaraṇī* victim, a razor, and nailscissors.[6] They go there where he has discovered (selected) a plain offering a suitable spot. Here[7] they dispose[8] his fires.

47. Then they dig a hole in this[9] quarter and shave [10] hair and beard. Having shaved hair and beard they trim his nails. Having trimmed his nails they take out his bowels.[11] Having taken out his bowels they remove the faeces. Having removed the faeces they bestrew it (as it is thrown) in the hole with sand. Thereby they cover his sin. Having washed his bowels they put them back (in his body) and take him up. Having[12] laid him down between the (two?)[13] fires he melts clarified butter on the gārhapatya and purifies it, takes four ladlings, goes[14] to the āhavanīya on which a fire-wood has been put and offers in it, while there is contact between the deceased and himself[15] (reciting:) "He[16] has come into existence through thee, thou through him. He is thy womb, his womb thou art. As a father clearing the way for his son lead him, Jātavedas, to the world of the virtuous. From him thou wast born, he must be born from thee, *svāhā*". He[17] arises immortal from this (fire) in the form of an oblation, consisting of mind, breath, sight, hearing, speech, Ṛc, Yajus, Sāman, Brahman and gold.

48. Then they pile up that funeral pyre. They[18] lay him thereon. On[19] his nostrils he should put down the two *sruva*-ladles; on his right hand the *juhū*; on his left the *upabhṛt*; on his chest the *dhruvā*; on his mouth the *agnihotrahavanī*; at his head the *iḍopahavana*; on his ears the two *prāśitra*-vessels; on his abdomen the *pātrī samavattadhānī*;[20] at his testicles the upper and the lower millstones; on his penis the yokepin; over his pudenda the skin of the black antelope; along his back the wooden sword; on both sides the two pestles and

the two winnowing baskets; at his feet the mortar. The other vessels he lays on top[21] (of his head). They throw the earthen ones away into the water, they give the iron ones[22] away. Then they cover him completely (or: fill him)[23] with clarified butter. They pour clarified butter into the sacrificial vessels.

49[24] Then they bring the *anustaraṇī* cow.[25] Having consecrated her (by sprinkling) and caused her to be lead around (the fires and the pyre) three times to the left[26] he should kill her with a hammer.[27] Some[28] lead her around to the right. But he should not do thus. They[29] cut out the omentum and spread[30] it on his head. They lay the kidneys on his hands, the heart on his heart, the fore-legs on his arms and distribute the other limbs over his corresponding limbs. Then they cover him with the skin (reciting:) "Prosper with your own body".[31]

Having spread out (the *anustaraṇī*) they set (the pyre) on fire. He[32] should try to do it so that the āhavanīya may reach him first — thereby the world of the gods approaches him — [and thereafter that the anvāhāryapacana (reaches him) — thereby the world of the fathers approaches him —; and thereafter that the gārhapatya (reaches him) — thus he[33] obtains a firm basis in this world with progeny and cattle].[32]

NOTES

[1] Oertel, o.c., p. 104 translates *yadā* by "if". For my rendering see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 351 and Macdonell, *Ved. Gr. f. Stud.*, p. 366.

[2] On *subhūmispaṣṭam* Oertel, o.c., p. 104 observes: "As second member of the compound *-spṛṣṭam* might be conjectured, for if *subhūmispaṣṭam* were "plainly a favourable spot", the order of the members of the compound ought to be reversed". According to Caland, "Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana", *Abh. K. M.* 12/1 (1903, repr. 1966), p. 44 f. one should read *yatrāsya samaṃ subhūmi spaṣṭaṃ syāt* (and below *yatrāsya samaṃ subhūmi spaṣṭaṃ bhavati*) and take *asya* (with the force of an instr.) with *spaṣṭam*. His parallels (e.g. BŚS. 4, 1 *yatrāsya yūpo spaṣṭo bhavati;* 10, 22 *yatrāsya svakṛtam iriṇaṃ spaṣṭaṃ bhavati*) are convincing, but accepting his view implies interpreting *subhūmi-* as a bahuvrīhi, whereas this therm obviously is a karmadhāraya GobhGS. 1, 4, 5. As a bahuvrīhi it seems to occur in HPiS. 1, 1: 33. 5 *samaṃ vā subhūmim* (Caland's conjecture *samaṃ vā bhūmim* is superfluous). Kashikar's rendering of the identical BhārPiS. 1, 1, 4 "Or (he should select) a good piece of ground wich is level" is misleading, since *subhūmi-* cannot be a karmadhāraya in this context, but should be taken with *dahanadeśam* (to be supplied from the context). Instead of BPiS. 1, 4 *api vā yaḥ samaṃbhumiḥ* (sc. *avakāśaḥ*) the almost literal copy of BPiS., ĀgnGS. 3, 5, has *api vā yā samā subhūmiḥ*. So *subhūmi-* may be taken as karmadhāraya as well as bahuvrīhi. The interpretation of the Subodhinī is rather different from Caland's: *yatra· yasmin pradeśe asya· āhitāgnes samam· animnonnataṃ su-*

bhūmi· sasyotpādanakṣma (r. *kṣama)tvādivakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇasahitaṃ spaṣṭaṃ· prakāśavat *ssalaṃ* (r. *sthalaṃ*) *labdhaṃ syāt tat sthalam* (..) *prāpya ṛtvijo brūyāt* .. It seems to interpret *subhūmi* as a bahuvrīhi, *spaṣṭam* as an adjective meaning *prakāśavat* (on this term see Lüders, Sb. Akad. Berlin 24, p. 233 f.) and *samam* as a substantivally used adjective. Though accepting Caland's interpretation I would refer for *spaṣṭa-* (= *prakāśavat*) "clear, clearly discernible, open, wide, not hidden from view (by trees etc.)" to ĀśvGS. 4, 1 *abhitaāśaṃ śmaśānam* "Die Leichenstätte biete nach allen Seiten einen freien Ausblick" (Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus*, p. 67), "Die Stätte sei ringsum offen" (Max Müller, *Z.D.M.G.* 9, p. II).

[3] On the transfer of the fires before death see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 5. His view (o.c., p. 6) "Für die eigentliche absicht dieses verfahrens ist wohl mit Frazer ("on certain burial customs", in Journ. Anth. Instit. XV, s. 84) zu halten 'the intention of interposing a barrier of fire to prevent the escape of the soul'" was rightly rejected by H. Hartmann, *Der Totenkult in Irland* (Heidelberg 1952), p. 47: "Diese Erklärung steht zu der bei der Handlung klar ausgesprochene Hoffnung, dass die Feuer, "die ja seine Lebensgeister sind ... richtig geschürt .. ihn durchbringen werden", in klarem Gegensatz". For the Irish and other parallels of the concept that the vital powers rest in one's fires see the same author, p. 46 ff. See also *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III.

[4] In Oertel's translation (o.c., p. 104) "If not, if he should depart this world, then they should take him" *yady u tan na* ("If not") seems to refer to the possibility that the sacrificer should not recover. Evidently this refers to the case of a sacrificer who has not transferred his fires before his death. According to Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 the Subodhinī seems to analyse *yady u tannayann asmāl lokāt preyād* (thus runs its text) as *yady u tad nayan* .. Probably, however, the commentary is corrupt and misunderstood by Caland. It takes *īśvaro vāgado* (r. *hāgado*) *bhavitoḥ* with the next sentence: *yady eṣa āhitāgniḥ rogārto 'pi* (r. *'py*) *agado bhavitoḥ· arogo bhavitum aham īśvaras· samartha iti matvā tat· uktalakṣaṇaśmaśānasthalam *anaya prāpnuvān* vāsmāl lokāt preyāt· paralokaṃ gacchet mriyetety arthaḥ athainam· āhitāgniṃ mṛtam ādadīran· uktaśmaśānadeśam prati ṛtvija evāprāpayeyur ity arthaḥ*. So the commentator interprets *tannayann* (all the JB. mss. read *tan na yad*) as *tad* (sc. the place of cremation) + *nayann*, hardly to be derived from *nayati* as Caland seems to have supposed, but consisting of the negation *na* + the participle *yann* (from *i-*). The corrupt words *anaya prāpnuvān vā* consequently should represent two negated verbal forms (expressing a movement), *aprāpnuvān* and a negated *(an-)* form of *i-* (a gerund? One would expect *anitvā*, if the verb is not compounded). The wrong interpretation of the Subodhinī (based on a wrong text) then runs: "If the āhitāgni thinking "I may perhaps recover" and therefore not going to the cremation place or not reaching it (in time) dies (at home), they should take him to that place".

[5] Oertel's punctuation *nānāsthālyor agnī opya hareyur anvāhāryapacanād ulmukam. ādadīran yajñapātrāṇi* .. should be adopted. Caland's emendation (*W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63) places a stop after *hareyuḥ*. In that untenable punctuation (followed by Raghu Vira) *ulmukam* is deprived of its predicate because *ādadīran* (referring to the transfer of the corpse and the implements) cannot at the same time denote the snatching of a fire-wood from the fire. Śrīnivāsa (whose text reads *opyāhareyuḥ*) construes *āhareyuḥ* with *agnī* and supplies this predicate in the next clause with *ulmukam*; a scarcely possible zeugmatic construction!

[6] For the funeral procession see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 19 ff. and Oertel, o.c., p. 104, n. 3.

[7] *tad* does not mean "thus" (Oertel), but "here" (see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63). Cf. Śrīnivāsa *tat· tatra śmaśānadeśe.*

[8] *agnīn viharanti* means "They arrange his fires in a *vihāra*" (see also Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 quoting the Subodhinī) and not "They transfer his fires" (Oertel). Cf. e.g. ŚB. 4, 2, 5, 11.

[9] A hole is dug to the south of the pyre. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 39 and GPiS. 1, 2, 24. According to Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63 *asyāṃ diśi* implies *dakṣiṇāprācyāṃ diśi*, the pronoun having a deictic force. Cf. BPiS. 1, 1: 4. 4 *imāṃ diśaṃ vihāraṃ kalpayitvā dakṣiṇāprācīm.* Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10, however, quotes the commentary and remarks that the S.W. quarter is meant. Since these words were accompanied by a gesture, it is not possible to establish the exact quarter if all the parallels do not agree. For this use of *asyāṃ diśi, imāṃ diśam* etc. see Caland, *Abh. K.M.* 12/1, p. 4. For a similar use of *etāṃ diśam* see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 17 a (referring to literature on this subject). Because the southern abode of death is denoted, one may assume, besides an indication of oral tradition also a taboo in this use of the pronoun. In the present passage *diśi* may even be a later addition and *asyām* be interpreted as "in the earth". Cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 5 *athainaṃ vipurīṣaṃ kṛtvā asyāṃ purīṣaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati.*

[10] The shaving etc. takes place at the *śmaśāna* in accordance with the practice of the Mādhy. and Rāṇ. (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 39, n. 160).

[11] For this disemboweling see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 15. Cf. BhārPiS. 1, 4, 1 (= HirPiS. 1, 4) quoting ŚāṭB. On this ŚāṭB. — JB. parallelism Ghosh, *Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas* (Calcutta 1935), p. 91 observes: "There is nothing like literal agreement here". The correspondence, however, is greater than his incomplete edition of the ŚāṭB. quotation and the JB. passage suggests. See the following comparison:

ŚāṭB.	*athainam udare vidārya nirāntraṃ*
JB.	*nirāntraṃ kurvanti nirāntraṃ*
ŚāṭB.	*niṣpurīṣaṃ kṛtvā*
JB.	*kṛtvā niṣpurīṣaṃ kurvanti niṣpurīṣaṃ kṛtvā*
ŚāṭB.	*avaṭe purīṣam avadhāya*
JB.	*pāṃsubhiḥ kūpe purīṣam abhisaṃvapanti pāpmānam evāsya*
ŚāṭB.	*prakṣālya pratyavadhāya*
JB.	*tat pracchādayanti prakṣālyāntrāṇi pratyavadhāyainam*
ŚāṭB.	*sarpiṣā pūrayatīti śāṭyāyanakam*
JB.	*āharanti .. (athainaṃ sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti* — 1, 48)

BhārPiS. probably does not give a literal quotation, but freely quotes and abridges the ŚāṭB. passage (notice *sarpiṣā* which in JB. is only found at the end of the next chapter). For instance *āntrāṇi* before or after *pratyavadhāya* is not likely to have failed in the original and is, indeed, found in the Ānandāśrama edition (Poona 1932) of the Satyāṣāḍhasūtra (which contains HirPiS.). According to ŚāṭB. the body and especially the abdomen rather than the intestines are filled with liquid butter (unless one assumes a very odd hysteron proteron). So ŚāṭB. may correspond to JB. 1, 48 *athainaṃ sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti* (for a different interpretation of *abhyutpṛ-* see, however, n. 23). The quotation does not allow for definite conclusions on the relation between ŚāṭB. and JB. Oertel, o.c., p. 106, n. 1 is, for that matter,

right in observing that it is doubtful "whether by Śāṭyāyanaka the Brāhmaṇa is necessarily meant. It is quite possible that the term includes the Sūtras".

This disemboweling is mentioned by ĀśvŚS. 6, 10 as the practice of some people *(niṣpurīṣam eke kṛtvā pṛṣadājyaṃ pūrayanti)* and BPiS. 1, 2 (followed by the younger Taittirīyas) even rejects it: *niṣpurīṣaṃ kṛtvādbhiḥ prakṣālya sarpiṣāntrāṇi pūrayitvā darbhaiḥ saṃsīvyati tad u tathā na kuryāt kṣodhukāsya prajā bhavatīti vijñāyate*. Notice that according to BPiS. (which does not explicitly refer to ŚāṭB.) the intestines seem to be filled with liquid butter. Its authority for the rejection of this practice may have been ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 5, which, however, offers an alternative: *athainaṃ vipurīṣaṃ kṛtvā asyāṃ purīṣaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati purīṣaṃ vā iyaṃ tat purīṣa evaitat purīṣaṃ dadhāti (..) tad u tathā na kuryāt kṣodhukā hāsya prajā bhavati tam antarataḥ prakṣālyājyenānvanakti medhyam evainat tat karoti*. In the last clause *enat* should not be interpreted with Eggeling as "it (the body)", but seems to refer to *purīṣam*. The argument for removing the bowels is that from the *vṛkalā* (an intestine?) a jackal *(vṛka-)* is produced when it is burnt. This is not found in JB. Again an indication that this section belongs to an old sūtra rather than to a Jaiminīya/Śāṭyāyana brāhmaṇa? A similar sort of word-magic is applied to the term *purīṣa-* denoting faeces and earth (see Renou, *I.I.J.* 4, p. 108 referring to TS. 5, 3, 5, 2 for another magical use of the two meanings of this term). ŚB. argues that a corpse without bowels (or with empty bowels) brings about an empty stomach in the progeny. So the intestines should remain in the corpse and be purified within the body *(antarataḥ)* by washing and anointing with ghee. Thereby one makes it, sc. the impure faeces, sacrificially pure *(medhyam)*. KŚS. 25, 7, 18 f. *(... vipurīṣaṃ cecchan. kešādi nikhāya sarpiṣāntaraktvā citāv enam ādadhāti)* makes the custom optional, but seems to have been misunderstood by the Karkabhāṣya: *sarpiṣābhyañjanaṃ prakṣālanaṃ ca vipurīṣapakṣa eva*, since *sarpiṣāntaraktvā* obviously refers to ŚB. *antarataḥ .. ājyenānvanakti*. What precisely takes place with the Mādhyaṃdinas is, however, not wholly clear. Apparently ŚB. accepts opening the abdomen. Even if the point of view of ŚB. may be younger than the (perhaps) rather obsolete practice of the Śāṭyāyana-Jaiminīya school, this does not imply that any conclusion on the relation between ŚB. and JB. may be drawn on the basis of this sūtra-like insertion.

[12] This ritual is performed at home by the Taittirīyas (see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 13), followed by KauṣGS. 5, 1. Cf. BPiS. 1, 1; BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18. The phrase *gārhapatya ājyaṃ vilāpyotpūya sruci caturgṛhītaṃ gṛhītvā* and the touching of the deceased is found in most parallel texts, but the mantras recited are different. Caland, o.c., p. 32 f. observes: "Nach ankunft auf der cremationsstätte wird von einigen śākhās, nl. den Śaunakins und Mānavas, wenn es sich um einen āhitāgni handelt, von den Kaṭhas und den folgern des Vaikhānasasūtra auch sonst ein opfer verrichtet. Allem anscheine nach entspricht dieses opfer der spende, welche von den Taittirīyas vor dem aufbruche nach der verbrennungsstätte dem Yama dargebracht wird". The parallelism with the Taittirīyas is, however, far from clear in these texts. Only JB. agrees with the Taitt. except for the mantra and the time of performance. It is irrelevant that in JB. this sacrifice is not performed at home because JB. transfers the whole funeral ritual to the *śmaśāna*. The meaning is identical. The corpse is laid on the vedi (Taitt.) or on the usual place for the vedi, where the funeral pyre later will be construed (JB.), and thereby becomes an oblation. If one looks for a parallel in the other texts, it has to be found in the cremation itself and its accompanying offerings (see Caland, o.c., p. 62 ff.) rather than in the sacrifices performed "nach ankunft

auf der cremationsstätte". In these accompanying āhutis of the cremation the same mantras which here occur in JB. (see n. 16) are used by the parallel texts. Apparently JB. combines the sacrifice at home in which the deceased is transformed into an oblation on the vedi (Taitt.; mantra: *pareyuvāṃsam..*) with the cremation ritual in which the deceased on the vedi/pyre forms a real oblation (most sources; mantra: *asmād vai tvam ..* or similar formulas). The ritual as described in JB. (the dead is placed on the spot of the vedi, i.e. on the spot reserved for the pyre, and evidently has to be removed during the piling of the pyre) does not appear to be the original. Remarkably enough the mantra *pareyuvāṃsam ...* which is recited in the Taitt. parallels of the present passage is used by the Śaunakins in the cremation ritual (Caland, o.c., p. 64).

[13] Perhaps *antareṇāgnīn nidhāya* should be read *antareṇāgnī nidhāya*. The corpse is placed on the spot of the vedi, where the pyre is also constructed (see n. 12). The position of this pyre is *antaragnī* according to KŚS. (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 37). In the parallel passage BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 the corpse is laid between the two (i.e. gārhapatya and āhavanīya) fires: *antaragnī nipātyānvārabdhe mṛta āhavanīye sruvāhutiṃ juhoti*. The corruption and emendation are rather simple in the context of JB.

[14] Read *gatvā* for the misprint *matvā* of the crit. ed.

[15] *anvārabdhe juhoti* "he makes oblation . . , while he touches (the corpse ..)" (Oertel, o.c., p. 105). For the meaning of this *contactus* see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 129 and 153. Now *anvārabdha-* may be passive as well as active (Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 53, p. 215 ff.) and the loc. abs. *(sam)anvārabdhe* mentioned by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 233 is rightly given an active meaning. Since the deceased himself cannot take action, he is in a particular situation. There are several passages in favour of Oertel's interpretation "while he touches (the corpse)". The parallel BPiS. 1, 1: 4. 8 reads *pretasya dakṣiṇaṃ bāhum anvārabhya*. Cf. also GPiS. 1, 1, 27 f. (a special rite for those who have neglected their fires) *dakṣiṇena hastena pretam ālabhya savyenāgniṃ japed (..) ājyena dvādaśagṛhītena srucaṃ pūrayitvā pretam agniṃ savyenānvālabhya .. dakṣiṇenāgnau juhuyād*. BPiS. 2, 5: 8. 2 has *pretasya dakṣiṇaṃ bāhum anvārabhya* in the parallel passage. On the other hand BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 *anvārabdhe mṛte* has not invariably been interpreted as "when the dead has been touched". See Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 53, p. 216: "Im Pitṛmedhasāra S. 14 werden diese Worte durch *pretānvārabdhaḥ*, im Prayogadarpaṇa S. 9 durch *pretenānvārabdhe* umschrieben; das vorzügliche Bhāṣya des Gopālayajvan sagt zu dieser Stelle; *ātmānam anvārabdhe, tasya dakṣiṇaṃ pāṇim ātmasaṃsparśaṃ kṛtvā*. Danach brachte man den rechten Arm des Toten mit dem opfrenden Adhvaryu in Berührung". Kashikar translates BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 "while the deceased is made to touch him". In this connection I may refer also to BhārPiS. 2, 10, 7 (= HirPiS, 2, 10: 58. 4), where the causative in *pretam anvārambhayitvā* also implies that the deceased is made to touch the officiant. The hand of the dead is brought into contact with the performer of the sacrifice. So in a way the dead may be said to touch or grasp the officiant. The reason why *anvārabdha-* has been taken in its so-called active sense (on these *-ta* formations see Gonda, *Lingua* 9, p. 65 f.) is the following. By touching the sacrificial substance or the officiant who handles this substance the sacral power inherent in the sacrifice is transmitted (Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 153). One, thus, receives the benefits of the sacrifice. In the funeral ceremony the dead must be made to participate in the sacrifice performed on his behalf. From a profane point of view the officiant seizes the corpse. The contact is, however, made in the interest of the deceased and not of the offi-

ciant, his medium for the communication with the sacral, immortal sphere. There is, however, no reason why one should not take *anvārabdhe* (without an accompanying noun) as a passive participle if, at least, the correct implication of this *contactus* is borne in mind. In the present passage the vague (passive) loc. abs. *anvārabdhe* "after a contact (between the corpse and the officiant) has been made" perfectly expresses the meaning of the ritual action. The contact as such is important, not the fact that for practical reasons the performer has taken the initiative. If one supplies the deceased as subject in this loc. abs., the most correct translation would seem to be (in view of the meaning of the verbal adjectice in *-ta-*) "while the deceased remains in contact (sc. with the performer)". Caland's remark (*Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 13) "Das Kauśikasūtra scheint gegen diesen brauch zu polemisieren, indem es sagt: 'den leichnam fasst er nicht an; über einem anderen, des sich noch regt (also einer anderen lebendigen person), spricht er den spruch aus'", is to be corrected. First the translation of *anyaṃ ceṣṭantam anumantrayate* should run (as in *Śrautakośa*, p. 1083) "he should follow with the relevant mantras the rites performed by another person". Moreover this passage does not refer to the sacrifice under discussion at all, but to the funeral rites in general. The performer of the funeral rites should never touch the deceased. The sacrifice described in the present passage does not seem to have any parallel in KauśS.

[16] On these mantras see the introduction to this section.

[17] For the end of ch. 1, 47 (inclusive of the last mantra) compare JB. 1, 2. See also ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 13/15 *tāṃ vā etām yajamānātmāhutim antato juhoti sa yo 'sya svarge loko jito bhavati tata āhutimayo 'mṛtaḥ sambhavati.* (..) *athaitām āhutiṃ juhoti* (..) *asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si tvad ayaṃ jāyatāṃ punaḥ. asau svargāya lokāya svāhā.*

[18] The Subodhinī reads *ādadhāti* instead of *ādadhati* and at the end of this chapter *upari nidadhāti* instead of *upari dadhati* (crit. ed. *upanidadhati*). In this sūtra-like description of the ritual the indicative shows a preference for the plural, whereas the optative mostly stands in the singular except in ch. 46 (where the singular would be quite out of place) and 1, 47 *juhoti*. See 1, 48 *tasyām enam ādadhati tasya nāsikayos sruvau nidadhyāt* (..) *pariśiṣṭāni yajñapātrāṇy upari dadhati;* 1, 49 *anustaraṇīm ānayanti tām* (..) *kūṭena hanyāt pradakṣiṇaṃ tad u tathā na kuryāt; saṃstīryopadīpayanti sa tathaiva cikīrṣed yathā* .. So the reading of the crit. ed. should be retained.

[19] For the piling of the sacrificial implements (and a comparison with parallels) see the introduction of this section.

[20] Instead of *saṃvartadhānīm* (mss. ra, la, śa: *saṃvattadhānīm*) read with Oertel, o.c., p. 107 *samavattadhānīm*. Śrīnivāsa's text has *saṃvartadhānīm*, his commentary *sam(a)vattadhānīm*. I have not followed his interpretation which separates *pātrīm* (i.e. *vrīhipātrīm*) from *samavattadhānīm* (see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10).

[21] Raghu Vira: *upanidadhati*; Oertel: *upari dadhati* (thus one ms. of the crit. ed.); Śrīnivāsa's text: *upari nidadhāti* (cf. n. 18); commentary: *upari·citopari*. At any rate *upari* (with or without *ni-*) meaning "above the head" should be read, as appears from the parallels.

[22] ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 14 disapproves of giving stone and earthen vessels to a brahmin and prescribes that they should be thrown into the water *(apa evainānny abhyavahareyuḥ)*. According to its sūtra (KŚS. 25, 7, 32 f.), which may have been influenced by JB., the metal vessels may be given optionally to a brahmin. Does BPiS. 1, 6 *apo mṛnmayāny abhyavahareyuḥ apo mṛnmayāny abhyav aharantīti*(cf. JB. *apo mṛnmayāny abhyavaharanti*) *vijñāyate* (..)

brāhmaṇebhyo 'yasmayāni lohamayāni ca dadyuḥ refer to JB. (especially in the quotation)? The son keeps all those implements and the millstones according to ĀśvGS. 4, 3, 18 f. and KauśS. 81, 18 f. (following ĀśvGS.?) makes the son keep the iron vessels and one millstone and has the earthen ones thrown into the water.

[23] *athainaṃ sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti* "Then they fill him up with liquid butter" (Oertel). Śrīnivāsa: *athainam paretaṃ sarpiṣā pūrṇāntaraṃ kurvanti.* How should one conceive of this filling with ghee? Is it poured into the abdomen which is still open (see n. 11)? Since all the openings are already covered with implements, pouring ghee into the prāṇa-openings seems to be excluded here. The only filling mentioned in other texts is that of the implements which have a cavity. Therefore *abhyutpūrayati* may have a different meaning, for which I refer to M.-W. s.v. *pṛī-* (p. 648). It may have the meaning "to cover completely, overspread, bestrew" since MBh., which would be very suitable in this context. Cf. GPiS. 1, 2, 32 f. *evam ājyam mukhe prathamaṃ ninīya pādaprabhṛtyā mukhāntāc ca santataṃ śeṣam.* Is *yajñapātreṣu sarpir āsiñcanti* a gloss on *abhyutpūrayanti*?

[24] For a translation of this chapter see also Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden*, p. 153 f. and Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1969), p. 127 f.

[25] The *anustaraṇī* ritual is not mentioned by the late Taitt. sūtras ĀgnGS. and VaiGS. Perhaps it went out of use. For those who had not performed an animal-sacrifice this rite should be omitted according to BPiS. 2, 3, or the victim should be released (as in the case of an *anāhitāgni*). In some texts the killing of the cow seems to be optional.

[26] According to BPiS. 1, 7 and BhārPiS. 1, 4 the victim is only lead around if it is to be released. This restriction is not made by KauśS. 81, 20 and the Jaiminīyas. On the *circumambulatio* see Caland, *Een indogermaansch Lustratiegebruik*, Amsterdam Acad. 1898. The turning to the left may be explained as a "Spiegelbildritus" (Gonda, *Religionen Indiens* I, p. 131), as is usual in the funeral rites, but the intention may also have been a protection of the living against the bad influence of the dead in the same way as the opposite turning by the right *(pradakṣiṇam)* protects the sphere within the *circumambulatio* against the evil from outside. Instead of *apasalam* (Oertel) Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63 proposes to read *apasalī*. The crit. ed. conjectures *apasalīm* (two mss. having *avasalī*, the rest *apasalī*). See also JB. 1, 345, where the crit. ed. reads *apasalair* (mss. *avasalā*; ms. va: *avasalī*), but according to Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 24 the correct reading should be *avasalī*. Cf. Caland's note on ĀpŚS. 24, 22, 1 *(prasavī)*; Renou, *J.As.* 231, p. 234; miss Gaastra, *Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra* (Leiden 1906), p. 10, n. 4 *(prasalī)*.

[27] Oertel did not emend *kūṭe* to *kūṭena* (which was not found in his mss.), because he felt "quite uncertain whether *kūṭa* always means 'hammer' and not also 'forehead'" (o.c., p. 114, n. 2). In *tasya na kūṭena praghnanti mānuṣaṃ hi tan no eva paścāt karṇam pitṛdevatyaṃ hi tat* (ŚB. 3, 8, 1, 15; quoted by Oertel) *kūṭena* cannot mean "on the frontal bone" (tr. Eggeling), as Oertel admits, but in his view "the evident contrast between *kūṭena* and *paścāt* is destroyed", if we translate "hammer". The contrast, however, is not between the spots to be hit, but between two manners of killing. "Behind the ear" is *pitṛdevatyam* since it is usual in the funeral rites of the Mādhyaṃdinas (see KŚS. 25, 7, 35). The instrument to be used may be an ordinary stick, but not a hammer (by which the skull is smashed in). Killing by means of a hammer seems to be *mānuṣa-*. One may perhaps compare JB. 1, 46, where the deceased is knocked down with a hammer by the Ṛtu. So *kūṭena* of the crit. ed. (see also Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63) is correct in JB., which does not prescribe

a killing behind the ear. The cow is also not to be killed with a sword; cf. BPiS. 1, 4 *tām anyatraiva śāstrād* (thus should be read; see Caland, ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 8, n. 1) *ghnanti*. The younger Taitt. have the victim killed *apidhāya mukham* (BhārPiS. 1, 5, 1). For parallels of this death from asphyxiation (Kashikar's translation of BhārPiS. "cover her face" misses the point) see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 261. MŚS. 8, 19, 17 *ajāṃ gāṃ vaikavarṇāṃ dakṣiṇāparasyāṃ diśi śavanirharaṇasya prathinā ghātayet* (crit. app. ed. van Gelder: mss. *prathināṃ*, cf. RV. 1, 8, 5, or r. *prathitām*) has been translated by miss van Gelder "He has a one-coloured she-goat or cow killed, as large as (the corpse), south-east of (the place where) the corpse is carried away". This interpretation does not seem to be convincing because of the word-order (the genitive following *diśi*). Moreover it is doubtful if *dakṣiṇāparasyāṃ diśi* can be construed with a genitive and mean "south-east of". What is "(the place where) the corpse is carried away" in the funeral ritual? *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1067 renders ".. by means of the extended portion of the bamboo used for the bier", a dubious but ingenious interpretation. KauśS. 81, 21 *tāṃ nairṛtena jaghanatāghnanta upaveśayanti* "She should be made to sit down towards the south-west while being hit on the hips" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 1085) is likewise an obscure passage. Should *upaveśayanti* be regarded as an euphemistic expression meaning "they kill"? In that case *jaghanataḥ* hardly means "on the hips"; perhaps "from behind". All these passages are obscured by the taboo sphere of killing a victim (especially in the funeral rites). The victim should be killed without making any roaring.

[28] I have not traced these *eke*.

[29] The distribution of the *anustaraṇī*'s parts of the body generally agrees with the parallel texts. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 54.

[30] For *parivayanti* read with Oertel *parivyayanti*. Compare the mantra *agner varma pari gobhir vyayasva* .. which is i.a. found BPiS. 1, 7. After *parivyayanti* a stop has to be placed. The remaining accusatives depend on *vicinvanti*. In fact *vi-* only refers to *itarāṇy aṅgāni* and expresses the idea of distribution. For the other accusatives *cinvanti* ("they pile") has to be supplied from *vicinvanti* ("they distribute").

[31] No parallels.

[32] *sa tathaiva cikīrṣed yathainam āhavanīyaḥ prathamo gacchet tad enaṃ devalokaḥ pratyāgacchati. atha yathānvāhāryapacanas tad enaṃ pitṛlokaḥ pratyāgacchati. atha yathā gārhapatyas tathāsmin loke prajayā ca paśubhiś ca pratitiṣṭhati*. Oertel's interpretation "He should endeavor to do it in this way: If the āhavanīya-fire should reach him first, then the world of the gods approaches him; and if (..) then (..); and if (..) then .." is hardly tenable. Obviously *tathā* and *yathā* are correlatives. For *yathā* .. *tad* meaning "if .. then" no parallels are to be found (in *atha yathāmuṃ lokam apyeti* at the end of JB. 1, 45 obviously *yadā* should be read instead of *yathā*). The desiderative and prescriptive optative *cikīrṣed* would be out of place if *yathā* introduces three possibilities arising at the kindling of the pyre. On the other hand some parallels seem to support Oertel's interpretation. Cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 9 ff.; ĀśvGS. 4, 4, 2 (apparently based on ŚB.); LŚS. 8, 8, 34 (= DŚS.); MŚS. 8, 19, 20 (derived from the SV. sūtras?); BPiS. 1, 7. See also Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 58. His interpretation of ĀśvGS. *svargaloka enaṃ prāpad* "die himmelswelt hat ihn erreicht" (o.c., p. 59, n. 230; contrary to Müller, Stenzler and Oldenberg, who regard *svargaloka* as a locative) seems to be confirmed by JB. The difference with those passages is that there all the fires are brought into contact with the pyre at the same time *(yugapad)*. The reaching of the corpse by the respective fires forms an *augurium* with

regard to the future of the deceased. In JB. this *augurium* is lacking, as appears from the form *cikīrṣed* (an *augurium* should not be influenced by human actions). The officiant should (opt.) try (desider.) to do the kindling in such a way that the *āhavanīya* reaches the body first, and thereafter that the anvāhāryapacana reaches it; *atha (tathā cikīrṣed) yathā* .. (with an ellips of *enam .. gacchet*, and not, as Oertel assumes, of *prathamaḥ*). This is also Windisch's interpretation, *Ber. K.S.G.W.* 59 (1907), p. 116: "Er (..) suche es so zu machen, dass (..), hierauf, dass (..), hierauf, dass ..". Similarly Hertel, o.c., p. 154. In the interpretation by Frenz, o.c., p. 127 f. "[Der Adhvaryu] soll es dabei so einzurichten suchen, dass den [Toten] das Āhavanīya-Feuer zuerst erreicht, dann öffnet sich dem [Toten] die Götterwelt. Wen [er es aber so einrichtet], dass (..) [zuerst erreicht], dann ..", the principle of the ellipsis does not seem to be understood. His rendering "Wenn" is odd, since it cannot refer to *yathā* (translated with "dass") or *atha* (which is not a subordinating conjunction). Perhaps, however, this passage was originally much shorter. See the Subodhinī and the Introduction of this Section.

[33] Hertel, o.c., p. 154 translates "in dieser Weise fasst man (d.h. der Sohn, die Erben) in dieser Welt festen Fuss durch Nachkommen wie durch Vieh". This change of subject is improbable. With Oertel one should consider this sentence to be inappropriate, as, for that matter, the whole JB. version of this topic is inappropriate and secondary without the augurium. Frenz, o.c., p. 128 translates "dann bleibt [der Tote] in dieser Welt [d.h. auf Erden] durch [seine] Nachkommen und durch [sein] Vieh bestehen", which is hardly tenable. Do people live on by their cattle? The expression *asmin loke prajayā ca paśubhiś ca pratitiṣṭhati* usually refers to living sacrificers who become substantial. There seems to be no covert allusion to the doctrine of transmigration. This phrase rather has to be explained as due to systematizing (gārhapatya means this world, means cattle and progeny in classifications).

51–65. *Expiations*

The following fifteen chapters (arranged in ten sections) deal with the expiations in the agnihotra ritual. On expiations in general see W. Gampert, *Die Sühnezeremonien in der indischen Rechtsliteratur*, Prague 1939; H. de Willman-Grabowska, "L'expiation (prāyaścitti) dans les Brāhmaṇa", *Bull. intern. de l'Acad. Polon.*, 1935, p. 237 ff.; J. von Negelein, *Atharvaprāyaścittāni*, New Haven 1915 (also published in *J.A.O.S.* 33 and 34). The section JB. 1, 51-65 has been edited by Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 23 (1902), pp. 331 ff. together with the parallel version of ŚB. For the agnihotra expiations see *Śrautakośa* I, *Sanskrit Section*, p. 83 ff. and *English Section*, p. 145 ff. The prāyaścittis of TB. have been translated by P.-E. Dumont, *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris 1968), p. 243 ff.

Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36 f. already observed that the expiations of JB. might have been borrowed from ŚB. His argument that the controversy with the Taittirīyas in 1, 52 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 4) is typically Yajurvedic and does not seem to have originated with the Sāmavedic JB., can now be supplemented with more (and perhaps stronger) proofs. See the Introductions of most of the following Sections and also n. 1 and 2 of 51-52; n. 1 and 5 of 53-54; n. 13 of 55-56; n. 5 of 61. Older than the ŚB. expiations are those of TB. and AB., to which ŚB. sometimes refers. Incidentally JB. seems to have been influenced by the sources of its own source; especially TB. See for the relation TB.-JB. the Introductions of 53-54; 58-59 and 62-63 (as well as Section 51-52, n. 7). The last prāyaścitti of 1, 65, which has no parallel in ŚB., was taken from AB. The version of JB. seems to be superior to ŚB. only once or twice. The transmission of the manuscripts of the latter, though being far better than that of JB., may be incidentally unreliable. See the Introduction of 55-56 and also 61, n. 16; 62-63, n. 3. Often the inconsistencies and the vagueness in the text of JB. seem to be due to careless or automatic borrowing. That the arrangement of the JB. expiations sometimes can only be explained as due to the order of the passages in the ŚB. source is contrary to the hypothesis of a common source. See e.g. Section 56 (last paragraph). This is especially significant because the prāyaścitti sections of ŚB. and JB. are on the whole differently arranged. JB. takes the related expiations together, whereas ŚB. in general bears in mind the sequence in the ritual when possible accidents can occur, i.e. it tries to follow the course of the agnihotra.

The first expiation (something passes between the fires) is indifferent as to the point of time. The beginning of 1, 52 does not coincide with a new expiation. The second expiation starts at the beginning of 1, 53 with the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ* .. (cf. 1, 51). JB. keeps running parallel to ŚB. in that the spilling during milking takes place at the beginning of the rite. JB. continues with the other

spilling of the milk (introduced by *atho khalv āhuḥ* and not beginning a new chapter), whereas further on ŚB. deals separately with these later accidents. JB. regards the accident where something impure falls into the milk as an entirely independent expiation and consequently makes it coincide with the beginning of a new chapter (1, 55) introduced with the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ*. JB. again takes all the related expiations together. ŚB. first deals with the pollution of the milk during and after milking and after the milk has been put on the fire. Then the text continues with other accidents and only at 12, 4, 2, 9 returns to the pollution of the milk (after it has been ladled in the spoon; i.e. in accordance with the course of the agnihotra ritual). Rain falling upon the milk does not form an independent expiation in JB. (1, 56) because it seems to be interpreted as belonging to the pollution of the milk. On the other hand the position of this expiation in the arrangement is remarkably parallel to ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 10 after 12, 4, 2, 9 *srucy unnītam amedhyam āpadyeta*), where the chronological order is decisive. The extinction of the coals (last paragraph of 56), though not connected with the preceding expiations, is introduced with *atho khalv āhuḥ*. The position of this expiation agrees perfectly with the ŚB. version, where *pūrvasyām āhutyāṃ hutāyām* correctly follows on *srucy unnītam* in the preceding expiation. In borrowing from ŚB. the two principles of arrangement seem to have been confused by JB. Does the fact that the expiring of the sacrificer directly follows on the expiring of the fire *(atho khalv āhuḥ ..)* imply that in this chapter (1, 57) JB. returns to its systematical arrangement? The sitting down of the cow starts a new chapter (1, 58; *tad āhuḥ yad etasya ..* etc.) as an entirely new expiation. For obvious reasons ŚB. has placed this passage more at the beginning of the prāyaścitti section. JB. 1, 60 incorrectly introduces a new expiation (*tad āhuḥ yad etasya ..*). See the introduction of the Sections 58-59 and 60. On the other hand the expiation for the presence of blood in the milk of the cow, which in ŚB. is also the next prāyaścitti (but opens a new chapter: 12, 4, 2 , 1), forms the second paragraph of JB. 1, 60 introduced by *atho khalv āhuḥ*. The last five chapters are announced *by atho khalv āhuḥ* at the end of the preceding chapters. They deal with the fires (extinction, fusion, etc.) and mostly have no relation with the chronological course of the process (the criterion for the arrangement of ŚB.). In the systematical arrangement of these expiations ŚB. and JB. to some extent agree, but sometimes the interpretation of the expiation brings about disagreements. For instance taking out fire to a fire which is still burning may be regarded as a fusion (JB. 1, 65) or be connected with the extinction of a fire (ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 4).

The relation between the other brāhmaṇas is less clear, but it may be assumed that AB. (at least partly) is younger than TB. See the introduction of Section 51-52; 61; 62-63. The expiations of KS. and MS. (of which the latter may be based on the former) are the oldest.

51–52. *Vehicles or animals pass between the fires*

For this first expiation compare ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 1-5 (for other parallels see below). In principle the two brāhmaṇas regard this expiation as superfluous (except for the passing of three unclean animals between the fires). Von Negelein's remark (*Atharvaprāyaścittāni*, p. XVIII) "Der freigeistigen Richtung, welche eine Hauptquelle des Śatapathabrāhmaṇa so deutlich kennzeichnet, entspricht es, dass selbst das Omen der eben erwähnten Opferzerreissung nur eine Loskaufszeremonie *(niṣkṛti)* und eine Spende *(iṣṭi)* erheischt. Nach noch liberalerer, eben dort erwähnter Auffassung soll man auf das Eindringen fremder Dinge oder lebender Wesen in keinem Falle, selbst dann nicht achten, wenn eine ganze Schar *(grāma)* es verübte" needs, however, some corrections. First *niṣkṛti* does not mean "Loskaufszeremonie" (this was also observed by Gampert, *Sühnezeremonien*, p. 29, n. 1), but "expiation". Secondly the *iṣṭi* is hardly a token of liberalism, but seems to refer to passages like MS. 1, 8, 9 .. *iti juhuyād yady ano vā ratho vāntarā viyāyāt*. Thirdly the liberalism of ŚB. is not so much based on indifference "wenn es sich um unwichtige Einzelheiten handelt" (in ritualism no detail is unimportant), as on a changing outlook. The constituents of the rite are equated with cosmic entities (this is, indeed, not entirely new) and (what is more important) from these equations a conclusion is drawn. If the two fires are heaven and earth, it is irrelevant to object to a passing of animals between them. These new conceptions may have originated with the ŚB. teachers. See also ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11 (= JB. 1, 60), where Āruṇi, basing himself on the equations *agnihotrī* = heaven, *vatsaḥ* = wind/sun and *agnihotrasthālī* = earth, observes: *na vā evaṃ viduṣo 'gnihotrī naśyati kva hy asau naśyet* .. AB. 7, 12, 3 similarly does not take offence at the passing of carts or dogs (r. *śvā*, not *'śvā*) between the fires, arguing that these fires are placed in oneself: *ātmany asya hitā* (not: *hi tā*) *bhavanti* (cf. ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 17 and see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III). It prescribes, however, a detailed expiation in case one takes offence.

For the three unclean animals which may give rise to an expiation, viz. *durvarāha eḷakaś śvā*, see TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 and AB. 7, 12, 3, which only mention the dog, and the Taitt. sūtras: BŚS. 27, 5 .. *gaur mahiṣo varāhaḥ*; BhārŚS. 9, 9, 3 (after dealing with the expiation for the passing of a dog between the fires) *etad eva sūkaraikasṛke* (mss. *sūkaresake, sūkarairake, sūkaraisake*; read perhaps *sūkaraiḍake*); ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 15 (not exclusively referring to the agnihotra) .. *durvarāhaiḍako vā*; HirŚS. 15, 3, 25 .. *gaur varāha eḍako vā*. The triad of the brāhmaṇas is the most original one. See BhārŚS. 9, 9, 1-3, where the dog, the hog and the *ekasṛka* or perhaps *eḍaka* are combined. ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 15 adds the *durvarāha* and *eḍaka* to an enumeration consisting of man, dog, cart and chariot. In the same enumeration HirŚS. 15, 3, 25 adds *gaur* before *varāhaḥ*. Was *durvarāhaḥ* later corrupted into *gaur varāhaḥ* in the

enumeration which contains besides unclean animals (the dog, the hog, and the goat) also unoffensive items such as man or chariots? This would imply that HirŚS. and the 27th book of BŚS. (BŚS. 14, 23 deals with the old TB. expiation of the dog passing between the fires) are younger than (this section of) ĀpŚS.

The *eke* to whom JB. 1, 52 refers in connection with the throwing of ashes are the Taittirīyas (TB. 1, 4, 3, 6, which is much more accurately quoted by ŚB. than by JB.). Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36 f. rightly observed that this polemic directed towards the Black YV. (one of the current topics in ŚB.) seems to indicate that JB. has borrowed from ŚB.

The arrangement of the expiation in ŚB. (12, 4, 1, 5) is more systematical than in JB. (1, 52, third paragraph): a) the Viṣṇu mantra restores the interrupted continuity of the rite; b) the water purifies the pollution by the unclean animals. In JB. both the mantra and the water are purifying. This makes the statement *tad yad evātra yajñasyāśantaṃ bhavati* .. rather superfluous whereas in ŠB. these words are essential. The restoration of the continuity by going from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya is not explained as such by JB., which, in borrowing this section from ŚB., apparently has not been careful in all respects.

On the meaning of this first expiation see D. J. Hoens, *Śānti. A Contribution to Ancient Indian Religious Terminology* (thesis Utrecht 1951), p. 43: "The road between the Gārhapatya and the Āhavanīya has been polluted by an impure animal or a profane vehicle passing by, that is to say: a foreign power has entered into the sphere of the sacrifice and has broken the continuity required for its success". The difference between two kinds of evil (interruption and pollution) should be more stressed. The passing of a vehicle originally constituted an independent case. MS. 1, 8, 9: 130. 9 mentions only a cart and a chariot. TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 deals only with the passing of vehicles, which is regarded as an interruption (and not as a pollution) and may be simply expiated by extinguishing the āhavanīya and taking out anew from the gārhapatya. TB. 1, 4, 3, 6, however, considers the passing of a dog to be an interruption as well as a pollution. The text criticizes the leading of a cow and the pouring of water over the track. According to Caland (in a note on his translation of ĀpŚS. 9, 6, 11) this should refer to MS. Probably MS. (which does not mention a dog) has inaccurately borrowed from its source, and TB. directly refers to this same source which either exclusively dealt with the passing of dogs or already had combined this expiation with the passing of vehicles. TB. replaces the cow and the water as an expiation against pollution by ashes *(bhasmanā padam apivapati śāntyai)* and scatters ashes from fire to fire in order to remove the interruption. AB. 7, 12, 3 combining the dog and the vehicles and showing a more modern outlook ("'he should not pay heed to it' they say") seems to represent a younger stage. ŚB. (followed by JB.) criticizes TB. It combines AB. (pouring of water from fire to fire) with TB. (recitation of the Viṣṇu mantra).

Among the sūtras the Taitt. follow their brāhmaṇa in maintaining the difference between the two kinds of expiations. BhārŚS. 9, 9, 3

seems to add two animals to the dog under influence of ŚB. (or JB.). On the other hand the younger Taitt. have a separate expiation in which the two TB. expiations, the interruption by a vehicle and the pollution by a dog (and other animals taken from other sources), are combined: BhārŚS. 9, 14, 4 ff. (man, dog, cart and chariot pass between the fires; according to others this should apply only to vehicles, as the sūtra states) forms a combination of MS. 1, 8, 9 (dealing with the passing of vehicles, but critized TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 in the expiation for the passing of dogs) and TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 (the passing of a vehicle). HirŚS. 15, 3, 25 ff. more or less agrees with Bhār., but adds to the items passing between the fires the cow, the hog and the wild goat (under influence from ŚB. ?). See also ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 15 (agreeing with HirŚS., but reading *durvarāhaḥ* instead of *gaur varāhaḥ*), where the mantra accompanying the leading of the cow over the track is not (as in MS.) *trayastriṃśat tantavaḥ* .. (this mantra being connected with the wrong expiation by ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 14; see Caland's note on his translation). The expiation of Āpastamba (followed by VaiŚS. 20, 19) does not (exclusively) refer to the agnihotra. AthPr. (a compilation of old and late prāyaścittis which does not form a unity) preserves at 5, 2 the twofold treatment of this expiation, whereas 1, 3 f. combines the dog and the vehicles. The latter passage as well as ŚŚS. 2, 6, 13 are based on AB. MŚS. 3, 4, 9 f. is influenced by the Taitt. and seems to be rather young (besides vehicles the text refers to all kinds of living beings including man, horses, crows). BŚS. 27, 5 also seems to be late. ĀśvŚS. 3, 10 ff. forms a combination of several expiations (AB.; MS.; TB.; vehicles, dogs, man).

51. It is assuredly a long sacrificial session upon which they enter who offer the agnihotra.[1] This is indeed a session (only) to be broken off through old age.[2] For one is absolved from it either by old age or by death.

Now they say: "If between the fires[3] of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra,[4] a yoked[5] (vehicle) should drive through or if there should be walked[6] (between these fires by living beings), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?"

[7]The wheel (of that vehicle) is the Vajra (i.e. Indra's thunderbolt shaped like a discus). The Vajra goes alongside his fires, between whose fires a yoked (vehicle) drives through or (living beings) walk.[7] He may[8] perform an expiation and may also offer an oblation. But he should not consider it thus. For he who establishes his sacrificial fires covers these worlds.

For him the gārhapatya becomes this world, the anvāhāryapacana the space between and the āhavanīya yonder world. In these worlds birds, both yoked in groups[9] and single, pass to and fro[10] as they

like. He should opine: "Even if a crowd has gone between my fires, this does not mean any misery and misfortune for me".

But, indeed, there are three domestic animals which are impure,[11] viz. the hog, the ram[12] and the dog. If any one of these should move[13] between (his fires), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?"

52. Now there are also some people who go scattering a handful of ashes (?)[14] from the gārhapatya up to the āhavanīya[15] with this verse: "Here Viṣṇu strode".[16] But he should not do it thus. If in that case any one should say: "Surely he has scattered the ashes of the sacrificer. Soon afterwards he will (really) scatter his ashes.[17] He will lose[18] the chief of the house[18]", then that would indeed come to pass so.

He should proceed thus: Having taken a water-pot or a water-jar he should go pouring it out from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya with the verse: "Here Viṣṇu strode". The *ṛc* is a divine purification,[19] water is a divine purification. Whatever here is unappeased of the sacrifice and whatever is impure, for all that, water forms the means of appeasing. So by water they appease it.[20]

NOTES

[1] *dīrghasattraṃ ha vā eta upayanti ye 'gnihotraṃ juhvati*. The same sentence is found in the version of ŚB. See also ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 2 *dīrghasattraṃ vā eṣa upaiti yo brahmacaryam upaiti*. In ŚB. the agnihotra is called a *dīrghasattra* in order to link up the *prāyaścitti* section with the preceding sections dealing with *sattras* (e.g. the thousand year session), whereas in JB. which borrows this passage the emphasis on the *sattra*ship has no function in the context.

[2] *etad dha vai sattraṃ jarāmūrīyam* (ŚB. *etad vai jarāmaryaṃ sattraṃ yad agnihotram*). Cf. TĀ. 10, 64, 1 (= MNU. 547; ed. J. Varenne, Paris 1960) *etad vai jarāmaryam agnihotraṃ sattram* "Oui, c'est cela le sacrifice quotidienne qu'il fera jusqu' à ce qu' il meure de vieillesse" (Varenne); "Dieses, fürwahr, ist sein bis zu Alter und Tod dauerndes Agnihotram, sein Sattram" (Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*). Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 44, p. 178 translates "a long session ensuring death in old age" and observes that "old-age-deathed" or "having old age for its extreme limit" seem to be the literal meaning of *jarāmaryam* and that the author "apparently takes it in the former sense, though interpreting the compound in his own way". In the quoted translations the interpretations of the compound are hardly tenable. The meaning is either "relating to old age and death *(maraḥ)*" (no idea of limitation being expressed) or "having old age as its limit *(maryā)*" (without any reference to death). The latter analysis seems to be preferable because the idea of limitation has to be explicitly expressed by the compound itself and the duration of the rite *(agnihotra = dīrghasattra)* should be mentioned. On the other hand it is conceivable that old age as well as death are the only factors which end the agnihotra. The reading *jarāmūrīyam* of JB., if derived from **jarāmūra-* (as Oertel, o.c., p. 331, n. 1 referring to PB. 15, 17, 3 *jīryamūra* —

read 25, 17, 3 and *jīryā mūra* — assumes), does not make sense because in this context "destined for one who is worn out by old age" does not make clear why the agnihotra is a *dīrghasattra*. Presumably *jarāmarya-* meaning "having *jarā* for its limit" was reinterpreted by the author of ŚB. by means of a typical brāhmaṇa "etymology" JB. borrowed this explanation, but substituted *jarāmūrīya-* for *jarāmarya-* (perhaps under influence of PB. 25, 17, 3, where *jīryā mūraḥ* occurs in the context of a *dīrghasattra* of thousand years). For the original ŚB. version see also AthPr. 3, 6 *jarāmaryaṃ vā etat sattraṃ yad agnihotram iti śrutir bhavati* and *Gṛhastharatnākara* (*B.I.* ed.), 102/12 *jarāmarttyāyaivaṃ satrāya dīkṣate* (apparently quoted from Hārīta), which is explained by *jarāmaraṇaparyyantaṃ atirekād anuṣṭhānaṃ kāryyam* (103/13).

[3] JB. reads *agnīn* against ŚB. *agnī*. The parallels (TB. 1, 4, 4, 10; AB. 7, 12, 4) prove that two fires, the gārhapatya and the āhavanīya, are meant. On the other hand ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 3 has *antareṇa grāmo 'gnīn viyāyāt*. That plural is undoubtedly due to the context which refers to the identity of the three worlds and the three fires. In *yo 'gnīn ādhatte* (JB. 1, 51) the plural has to be accepted on the same grounds. JB. *agnīn antareṇa* : *agnīn ādhatte* = ŚB. *antareṇāgnī* : *agnī* (!) *ādhatte*.

[4] The mss. (except *ya*) read *agniṃ juhvato* instead of *agnihotraṃ juhvato* (ŚB.). Even if the reduction of *agnihotram* to *agnim* may be acceptable (see Oertel, o.c., p. 331, n. 5 referring to literature on this subject), I doubt whether *agnim* is correctly retained (by Oertel and the crit. ed.) in this stereotyped phrase, which is found in the chapters 53; 55; 58 and 60 with the reading *agnihotram*.

[5] *yuktam* stands for *ratha-* or *anas* of the parallel texts (TB. 1, 4, 4, 10; AB. 7, 12, 3; MS. 1, 8, 9) and therefore does not primarily mean "team" (Eggeling), but "(horse-)drawn vehicle"; a vague expression which includes *anas* as well as *ratha-*, just as *sam .. careyuḥ* does not specify the animals which may pass between the fires. Not the team of horses, but the vehicle and especially its wheels make the dangerous incision in the continuity of the sacrifice. For *yuktam* compare ṢaḍvB. 1, 2, 10 *ano yuktam* "this cart .. yoked (with two oxen)" (tr. Bollée).

[6] The subject of *sam .. careyuḥ* are all sorts of animals rather than "people" (Eggeling). The vagueness of the original is best retained in a passive construction.

[7] *vajro vai cakraḥ vajro vā etasyāgnīn anveti yasyāntareṇa yuktaṃ vā viyāti saṃ vā caranti* is not found in the ŚB. version and in Oertel's edition (see, however, his note 4, o.c., p. 331, in which some corrupt fragments of this passage are quoted). This insertion in the expiation borrowed from ŚB. has been adopted from TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 *vajro vai cakraṃ vajro vā etasya yajñaṃ vicchinatti yasyāno vā ratho vāntarāgnī yāti*. The passage from TB. has not been adapted satisfactorily to the new JB. context as *sam .. careyuḥ* does not refer to chariots or carts. The ellipse of *agnīn* in *yasyāntareṇa* is harsh.

[8] *kurvīta haiva niṣkṛtim api heṣṭyā yajeta. tad u tathā na vidyād*. The first optatives, though occurring in a principal clause and not in apodosis, are used in the sense of a supposition. This use of the optative is more current than is assumed by Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 335. See also Gonda, *Character of the I. E. Moods*, p. 58 f; 60. Moreover the meaning of these so-called "potentiale Optative" is not uniform. Here e.g. *kurvīta* does not express a possibility which may or may not arise during a rite ("it may happen that.."), but refers to a less recommendable alternative ("he may, if he wishes .., but a better solution were .."). The initial position of *kurvīta* stresses this verb-form and especially its optative aspect ("He may, indeed perform ..").

[9] Here *yuktam* (adv.) represents a reinterpretation of *yuktam* (noun) above.

[10] Read with Oertel *vayāṃsi saṃcaranti* instead of *vayāṃsi ca caranti*.

[11] According to D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva *und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa* ... (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 8 *amedhya* (the ŚB. version has *ajuṣta-*) should mean "unaromatisch".

[12] For *eḍaka* Oertel's mss. read *eḷakaḥ* with *ḷ* as usual in Jaiminīya texts (see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 f.).

[13] Oertel's conjecture *sam īyeta* (mss. *sannejīyeta*) was rejected by Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63, who remarks: "vielleicht liegt eine Form von *ejate* vor: *sann ej*° oder *samej*°". Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 2 observes: "Wie aus dem ŚB zu ersehen ist, muss es sich um ein Verb des Gehens handeln. Nach der 4. Klasse flektiert $\sqrt{i}$ auch p. 31, 33. 32, 6" (the numbers refer to the crit. ed.), and translates the form by "liefe". But the unanimous evidence of the manuscripts points to *ej-* instead of *i-*. One may also compare ŚB. 3, 1, 3, 28 *agnir vai yonir yajñasya garbho dīkṣito 'ntareṇa vai yoniṃ garbhaḥ saṃcarati sa yat sa tatr aijati tvat pari tvad ā vartate tasmād ime garbhā ejanti tvat pari tvad ā vartante tasmād asyaiṣa saṃcāro bhavati*. Whatever may be the correct reading, JB. apparently has replaced *saṃcaret* (ŚB.) by an optative of *ejati*.

[14] In *chādimuṣṭim* (Oertel: *cchādim uṣṭim*) only the meaning of *muṣṭi-* is established (see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63). Probably *cchādi-* has to be derived from *chad-* "to cover" and denotes a material used for covering (ŚB. version: *bhasman*).

[15] The sentence *gārhapatyād āhavanīyān ninayann *īyāt* (or: **ninayantīyāt*) has been inserted and transferred erroneously from below (where it precedes the same mantra) according to Oertel, o.c., p. 332, n. 10, who omits it. His argument that the reading *yantī* of two manuscripts (in the preceding clause) "would seem to indicate that the quotation *idaṃ viṣṇur*, etc., followed immediately" sounds quite convincing. All the manuscripts used by Raghu Vira, however, read *yanti*. Undoubtedly the passage is corrupt since *ninayati* refers to the pouring out of water rather than to the scattering of ashes (which for that matter has already been expressed by *nivapanto*). On the other hand one should not omit the whole sentence, as Oertel has done, because the direction one must follow has to be described. Therefore read *nivapanto yanti gārhapatyād āhavanīyād idaṃ viṣṇur* .. etc.

[16] ṚV. 1, 22, 17.

[17] *kṣipre paramāsān āvapsyate* "he will soon scatter his last ashes" (Eggeling). I read *param āsān* (cf. Viśva-Bandhu Śāstrī, *A Vedic Word-Concordance* II referring s.v. *para-* and *āsa-* to ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 4) and take *param* with *kṣipre*. In the parallels of this stereotyped way of reasoning *kṣipre*, however, occurs without *param*. Notice the difference between the active *āvāpsīt* (the action of the unconcerned priest scattering ashes which without his knowledge turn out to be the ashes of the sacrificer's corpse) and the middle *āvapsyate* (the scattering performed by a man who is concerned in his action: "soon he will know what it means to scatter ashes"). See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 117 on this aspect of the middle voice.

[18] *jyeṣṭhagṛhyaṃ rotsyati* "the chief's household will be wailing" (Eggeling). According to M.-W. *jyeṣṭhagṛhya-* means "the eldest member of a family" and *rotsyati* is the future of *rudh-* (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, s.v.), whereas *rudiṣyati* is the future of *rud-* "to wail". See also ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 8 *kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātṛvyo janiṣyate priyatamaṃ rotsyati*, where Eggeling, observing in a note that Harisvāmin takes *rotsyati* as from *rudh- (rodhena māraṇaṃ lakṣyate*

mārişyatīty arthaḥ), translates ". . he (the Sacrificer) will weep for him who is dearest to him". Obviously *rotsyati* should be derived from *rudh-* meaning "to be deprived of", "to lose", originally "to drive away from oneself" or perhaps "to bring to ruin" (cf. Latin *perdere*; Greek ὄλλυμι). It is also interpreted in this way by most translators BĀU. 1, 4, 8 *(sa yo 'nyam ātmanaḥ priyaṃ bruvāṇaṃ brūyāt priyaṃ rotsyatīīśvaro ha tathaiva syād . . sa yo ātmānam eva priyam upāste na hāsya priyaṃ pramāyukaṃ bhavati)*. The parallels prove that *rotsyati* is the opposite of *janişyate* (see also ŚB. 12, 5, 1, 17) and refers to loss and destruction *(pramāyuka-)*. For the derivation from *rudh-* compare also TB. 1, 6, 5, 2; 3, 3, 3, 1 *priyaṃ jñātiṃ rundhyāt.*

[19] According to AB. 6, 36, 11 verses to the purifying soma *(pāvamānyaḥ)* are a *devapavitram.*

[20] Instead of *evainaṃ tac* read with ŚB. *evainat tac.*

For this second expiation see ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 6 ff.; 2, 6 ff. This source (in which, as in JB., the expiation for something passing between the fires directly precedes) retains the chronological order of the ritual in its expiations and consequently does not treat all the spilling expiations together. There are, moreover, some minor, but not insignificant, differences. According to ŚB. at every spilling the milk spilt should be touched and water must be poured out (the prāyaścitti). Thereafter one should offer *pariśiṣṭena* (respectively *yad anyad vindet tena; yat sthālyāṃ pariśiṣṭaṃ syāt tena*) (the karman). The karman in JB. agrees, but no prāyaścitti is prescribed in the case of a simple spilling and water is not poured out when the sthālī turns topsyturvy. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 6 omitting details (e.g. the mantra, to which it only refers by *skannaprāyaścittena*) offers a short summary of the expiation with the necessary karman prescriptions. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7-8 dwells at length on the prāyaścitti aspect and distinguishes between the spilling as such *(atha yatra skannaṃ syāt)* and the breaking of the sthālī *(atha yatrāvabhinnaṃ syāt)*, which forms an additional prāyaścitti. This clear-cut distinction between the two aspects of this expiation does not imply that *yatra .. tad* (at the beginning of ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7 and 8) should be taken as "in case ... (then)" (Eggeling). For the purely local *yatra .. tad* compare JB. 1, 54 *yatrāhavanīyasya bhasmoddhṛtaṃ syāt tad upanivapet; yatraiva skandet tad upaviśed* (= ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad evopaviśed, tad eva* meaning "on the spot"); MS. 1, 8, 3: 118. 3 *yatra skandet tad apo ninayed* (Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 42 incorrectly renders "When it (the milk) is spilt, then he should pour down water"). Because of *yatra* and the context *tad* should have the sense of "there". For *tad* meaning "there" see also the last phrase of JB. 1, 46. Eggeling's translation, which seems to imply that *askann adhita prājani* is only recited when the milk is spilt (and not in case the pot breaks), creates an opposition between the spilling and the breaking. In fact, the breaking constitutes a special subdivision of the spilling expiation. One must touch the spilt milk (and recite the mantra) on every spot where the milk is spilt (even if the spilling is due to a crack). Water is poured out on the spot where the pot breaks as a means of expiation against the rupture. The composition of the JB. passage (in which the first *yatra .. tad* phrase is missing) seems to be less original. The pratīka of the mantra *askann adhita* has been transferred to the first paragraph of 1, 53 and therefore the brāhmaṇa explanation *yadā vai skandaty atha dhīyate ..* etc. does not directly follow the mantra.

Another difference between the two brāhmaṇas arises in the expiation for the spilling of milk which is being taken to the āhavanīya. According to ŚB. milk is again ladled out at the gārhapatya and taken (in the *sruc*) to the priest. In the version of JB. the sthālī is taken to the performer and the milk is ladled out on the spot. The version of ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 seems

to have a better composition. In JB. *tad ada evāsyonneṣyāmīty uktaṃ bhavati atha yathonnītam unnīya samidham ādāya prāk preyāt* the adverb *adas* may be local ("there, at the gārhapatya"), but in ŚB., where the milk is ladled out again at the gārhapatya, it can only refer to a former occasion. For *adas* in connection with "une procédure déjà vue" see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 191 a. The contrasting *atra* "here, now, on this occasion" (ŚB.) is ill spared in the JB. version. Moreover *tad* (before *adas*) is rather strange in the context. In the version of ŚB. it constantly refers to the milk: *tad asmā unnīyāhareyuḥ ... tad agnāv adhiśritya .. tad — ado haivonneṣyāmīty uktam bhavati* .. — (parenthesis in a slightly anacolouthic sentence) *athātra yathonnītam evāsmā unnīyāhareyus tena kāmaṃ juhuyāt.*

The expiation of this section has several parallels in other texts. A survey of these correspondences may be useful as some translations are not reliable. According to the oldest texts (KS. 6, 3; KapS. 4, 2; MS. 1, 8, 3) another pot should be used if the first breaks during the milking, and another cow should be milked for additional milk *(anyām abhiduhyāt)* in case the milk is spilt after the pot has been put on the fire. This is criticized by TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 *(yad abhiduhyāt ārteṇānārtaṃ yajñasya saṃsṛjet)*. The YV. Saṃhitās further prescribe *yatra skandet tad apo ninayet*, a sentence which in KS. and KapS. concludes the expiation and is added as a general rule prescribing that at every spilling (and breaking of a vessel followed by spilling) water should be poured out on the spot where the milk has been spilt. In the apparently later MS. version it has been transferred to the beginning of the passage. That *yatra .. tad* .. here are used as adverbs with a local sense (see above for a different interpretation) appears also from MS. *yatra vā etā* (sc. *āpaḥ*) *asyā upayanti tat praśastatarā oṣadhayo jāyante.* For this pouring of water on the milk spilt see also TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 (spilling during milking) *apa upasṛjati, adbhir evainad āpnoti.* The *Śrautakośa* I, p. 356 translates this passage (as quoted by BŚS. 14, 23) "One should pour water (on the remaining milk). He, indeed, obtains it with water". See also Dumont, *Mélanges d'indianisme*, p. 246 "(Puis) l'adhvaryu verse de l'eau (sur ce qui reste de lait dans le pot). (En faisant cela) il obtient (c'est-à-dire récupère) par l'eau (le lait qui a été répandu)". In view of the YS. parallels (and ŚB./JB.) one may assume that water is poured on the milk spilt rather than on the rest of the milk. The milk in the pot is not replenished by water, but the spilt milk is recovered by means of water (for the etymological magic *āpaḥ / āpnoti* see ŚB. 1, 1, 1, 14 with Eggeling's note; cf. ParGS. 1, 3, 13), lest it should be lost for the sacrifice(r) and exercice its powerful influence in a wrong way. See Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 37, whose remarks are partly (the milk is not yet cooked here) also applicable to this passage.

The expiation of AB. 7, 5, 2 *(agnihotram adhiśritaṃ skandati vā viṣyandate vā)* prescribes that the milk spilt should be touched and water be poured out (cf. ŚB.). Keith renders *tad adbhir upaninayet* "He should pour water on it" (and seems to make "it" refer to the rest of the milk) and *athainad dakṣiṇena pāṇināabhimṛśya* "then he touches (the rest) with

his right hand". Apart from practical difficulties (the milk is very hot) one may object to this interpretation that AB. 7, 3, 4 (= 5, 27, 7; the spilling during milking) evidently states that the spilt milk should be touched *(sa yat tatra skandayet tad abhimṛśya)*. Cf. also AthPr. 1, 3 (spilling during offering) *atha yatraivāvaskannaṃ bhavati taṃ deśam abhivimṛjya .. ālabhya*. The meaning behind this touching seems to be that by this *contactus* one again transfers the (power of the) spilt sacrificial substance to the sacrifice. This touching and pouring of water is also found in ŚB., but JB. omits the pouring of water (pouring water when the pot has been broken has a different function). On the other hand AgnPr. 8 b (quoted by von Negelein, n. 711) prescribes (in case of a *viṣyandanam*, cf. AB. 7, 5, 2) that water should be poured on the remaining milk: *adhiśritāvasthāyāṃ payoyavāgvādyagnihotradravyaviṣyaṃdanena yadāgniṃ prāpyate tadā sthālīgatadravyopary udakam upasiṃcet athainad dakṣiṇena pāṇināmimṛśya* ... etc. (= AB.) ... *tataḥ sthālīgatam apsu prakṣipet .. yadā bhūmiṃ prāpyate tadā .. āhavanīyasya bhasmamadhye prakṣipet*. Apparently this text does not (as AB.) combine the spilling and the boiling over. The latter seems to imply that the oblatory material is impure and should be thrown away. This passage seems to be a late adaptation of the AB. expiation and does not prove that *abdhir upaninayet* in AB. should refer to pouring water on the rest of the milk. Remarkably AthPr. 1, 5 (*yasyāgnihotraṃ śrāpyamānaṃ viṣyandayet tad adbhir upaninayet tad anumantrayate pṛthivīṃ turīyam iti ..*".. one should pour water over the spilt milk .." — tr. *Śrautakośa* I, p. 160) agrees with AB. 7, 5, 2, whereas AthPr. 4, 3 separates the expiation for the boiling over *(antaḥparidhideśe ninayet)* from the spilling. If the latter takes place, "one should throw the milk into water" *(Śrautakośa* I, p. 157, translation of *samudraṃ tvā prahiṇomīty apo ninīya)*. Compare, however, AgnPr. 6 b (von Negelein, n. 714) *yāvat skannaṃ tāvanmātraṃ duṣṭam bhavati na pātragatam. samudraṃ vaḥ prahiṇomi .. iti maṃtreṇa duṣṭasyābhimaṃtraṇābhimarśane taṃtreṇa kuryāt tata apo 'bhyavahareyuḥ;* ĀśvPr. 3 b (von Negelein, o.c., n. 723) *atha dohanādiprācīnaharaṇāt prāg yadi skanne samudraṃ va iti .. japet. tad apsu prakṣipya pātragataśeṣeṇa homaḥ*. The same passage states that if the milk is spilt after being ladled out, one should touch this spilt milk (with a different mantra) and throw it into the water *(abhimṛśya apsu prakṣipya)*. If the remainder of the milk is sufficient for an oblation, one offers this or ladles out anew. The spilt milk (which may be regarded as impure) was originally thrown into water (and not all the milk). On the other hand BrahmPr. 41 b (quoted by von Negelein, n. 724 together with another passage on throwing into water) *samudraṃ vaḥ prahiṇomīty anena maṃtreṇāpa upaninīya nīcau* (r. *nīcair*) *dravyaṃ prāpyaṃ yatra skaṃdet tad apo ninayed iti brāhmaṇam* seems to refer to pouring water on the milk spilt, which thereby can be obtained back *(prāpyam;* cf. TB. *āpnoti)*. Moreover the mantra *samudraṃ vaḥ prahiṇomi* (AV. 10, 5, 23; the Paipp. read *upasṛjāmi;* cf. TB. *apa upasṛjati*) is only used in the ritual if water is poured out. The plural *vaḥ* refers to the plural *āpaḥ*. The younger Taitt. (BhārŚS. 9, 7, 5; ĀpŚS. 9, 5, 6) use the same

mantra in connection with pouring water on the spilt milk (*adbhir upasṛj-, upanī-*; see Caland's translation of Āp.; Kashikar's wrong rendering of Bhār. has been corrected in the Errata).

One may conclude that the mantra *samudraṃ vaḥ prahiṇomi* in the post-brāhmaṇa period sometimes was used for pouring water on the spilt milk. Some late texts retain the mantra but change the expiation by throwing the spilt (= impure) milk into water. Sometimes even all the milk is thrown away. AthPr. has adapted the mantra to its new function by changing *vaḥ* (the waters) into *tvā* (the oblation). One of the starting-points for this change may have been a misinterpretation of the acc. *apaḥ* (object, but interpreted as an acc. of goal). This would imply that texts, rather than ritual practices, were transmitted and borrowed.

Of special importance is the spilling of the milk after it has been ladled out and taken to the āhavanīya. In the YV. Saṃhitās the priest returns to the gārhapatya (a point which is criticized in most later texts), pours the rest back into the *sthālī* and another cow is milked upon it (criticized by TB., see above). AB. 7, 5, 6 states *sa yady upanivartayet svargāl lokād yajamānam āvartayet atraivāsmā upaviṣṭāyaitam agnihotraparīśeṣam āhareyuḥ* (cf. JB.). Since the āhavanīya represents heaven and the oblation the sacrificer himself (who offers for himself a new body, a new existence in yonder world, i.e. he offers himself), returning from the āhavanīya with the oblation means turning back the sacrificer from heaven. TB. 1, 4, 3, 5 considers the return to be a cleavage of the sacrifice and further agrees with AB.: *yatra skandet tan niṣadya punar gṛhṇīyāt yatraiva skandati tata evainat punar gṛhṇāti*. Dumont's translation of *niṣadya* "après avoir déposé (le pot d'où l'on a puisé le lait)" (o.c., p. 246) is untenable (correct: *Śrautakośa* I, p. 166 "one should sit down"). Here JB. agrees with TB. and AB., whereas ŚB. prescribes that the milk should be ladled out at the gārhapatya and brought to the sitting officiant (explicitly rejected by AgnPr. 7 b; see von Negelein, n. 49: *tatraivopaviṣṭa unnayet na svayaṃ srug vā pratyag gachet*). JB. does not just copy ŚB.; sometimes it consults the sources and predecessors of ŚB. For the criticism of the return to the gārhapatya see also AthPr. 1, 3 (evidently based on AB.). It is worth mentioning that ŚB. agrees especially with AB.: touching of the spilt milk; *upaninayet / upaninīya* (AB./ŚB.); no second expiatory milking and offering; *svārgāl lokād yajamānaṃ āvartayet / prati nvā ayaṃ svargāl lokād avārukṣat* (AB./ŚB.); *yathonnīti / yathonnītam* (AB./ŚB.), etc. JB. borrowing this passage from ŚB. seems to be influenced by TB.: *uddrutasya / prāca uddrutasya* (TB./JB.); the ladling out by the sitted priest himself (occurring, however, also in AB.). The fact that JB. 2, 41 deals with a different spilling expiation *(tasmād yad agnihotrasya vājyasya vāvaskandet tad abhimṛśed bhūpataye svāhā bhuvanapataye svāhā bhūtānāṃ pataye svāheti)* supports the assumption that the prāyaścittis in the agnihotra section (and presumably the whole agnihotra section itself) form a later addition.

As for the relation between the other texts one may note that KS. 6, 3 (= KapS. 4, 2) and MS. 1, 8, 3 agree very closely. The latter passage

because of its composition and some additions gives the impression that it is the younger version. The relation between the two brāhmaṇas TB. and AB. (which both argue against the YV. Saṃhitās) is obscure in this passage. AB. 7, 5, 2-7 scarcely resembles TB. (which does not mention the spilling of milk put on the fire and the breaking of the ladle). Only AB. 7, 5, 6 to some extent agrees with TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 *(uddrutasya skandet)*. AB. 7, 3, 7 (= 5, 27, 7) deals with the spilling during the milking and shows some striking agreements with TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 (there are more agreements between AB. 5, 27 and TB. 1, 4, 3). The expiations of AB. 5, 27 and 7, 2 ff. apparently belong to different levels of the texts. Similarly TB. has a double treatment of the expiations: 1, 4, 3-4 and 3, 7, 1-3 (the spilling expiation 3, 7, 2 is based on KS. 35, 19). Among the sūtras as usual Baudh. strictly follows the own brāhmaṇa. The younger Taitt. accept practices which had been rejected by TB. These younger Taitt. agree with ĀśvŚS. and MŚS. on some points, e.g. the use of the mantra *samudraṃ vaḥ prahiṇomi* (see *Śrautakośa* I, *English Section*, p. 157; 167 f. for the spilling).

On the meaning of this expiation see Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 41 f., whose interpretation only concerns the *śānti* aspect. It may, however, be questioned whether the spilling or boiling over of the milk implies that "there is an evil power in the milk, which will cause the sacrifice to fail. Water extinguishes the blaze of the evil power" (o.c., p. 41) and whether in case the implements break there is an "inimical power in the sacrifice, which becomes manifest in the crack" (p. 43). Water may (especially in connection with the conception of *śānti*) have the function of extinguishing something dangerous, but the assumption of inimical powers which influence the sacrifice seems to be debatable. One might as well posit that the most important factors for an expiation are the failure or accident as such and its possible, evil results rather than the cause of the accident (e.g. an evil, inimical power). Expiations are made for (what we should call) ethical tresspasses, unconscious mistakes, ritual faults due to the officiant himself or to external circumstances etc. without any distinction. The accident itself, i.e. the spilling, is essential. No human being is blamed for it and no evil power forms the cause of the accident. Since the sacrifice is an operation which sets going a process with cosmic potencies to the benefit of the sacrificer, every failure should be expiated and, if possible, be undone. It may affect the sacrificer's welfare (the milk represents his life or his body) and therefore TB. tries to obtain or get back the lost milk by pouring water on it *(āpaḥ / āpnoti)*. Moreover the result of the accident, i.e. the fact that spilt milk is lying on the earth, may be regarded as dangerous. That milk is not (or does not contain) an evil power; it is identical with the milk in the *sthālī*. The difference is that the spilt milk (which no longer forms a part of the oblation and does not contribute to the success of the rite) may have evil influence as an uncontrolable power if it is not neutralized. Belonging to the sacrificer's life and body (oblation = sacrificer) it is as dangerous as nails or hairs carelessly thrown away. By pouring water on it the lost, powerful material is extinguished, eliminated,

neutralized (see also Hoens, o.c., p. 37). Pouring water on the broken pot means restoring the wholeness of that implement, rather than expelling evil, inimical powers which would have caused the crack or manifest themselves in that fissure. It is explicitly stated that an *udapātram*, *udasthālī* or *udakamaṇḍalu* should be poured out. This means that by one, uninterrupted jet of water the scattered pieces of the broken pot are again connected and the broken continuity is restored (just as in the expiation of JB. I, 52 for the passing of something between the fires). The function of the water is completely different from the one it had when it was poured on the spilt milk.

53. Now they say: "If the agnihotra milk of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should be spilt while being milked out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Whatever may be left in the pot, with that he should offer. "If, however, the pot should be turned topsyturvy or if it should break, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having touched (the spilt milk) with the expiatory formula for spilling "There has been spilt, there has been conceived" he should offer with what else he may obtain.

When there is spilt (effused, emitted), then there is conceived.[1] Now the milk is seed and this (earth) a womb.[2] Thus he places seed in a womb. For him[3] who knows thus seed which has been shed does not fail[4] to be born forth.[2] From yonder world rain *(parjanya)* is shed (and) here (on earth) herbs and trees are produced. From man seed is shed *(skandati)*, from animals (it is shed), (and) therefrom all here (that lives) is born. He should consider: "The gods have come to my aid.[5] My generative power has been increased.[6] I shall become more prosperous." (And) this would come to pass so.

And where this breaking (of the pot) takes place, there he should pour out a water-pot or a water-jar on it with these utterances: "*bhūr bhuvas svar*". Now these utterances are expiations for all.[7] So with this All he makes expiation.[8]

54. Then, having collected[9] these potsherds, he should throw them away on the spot where the ashes from the āhavanīya are removed. This is the rite (performed) in that case.

Now further they say: "If there should be spilt of the milk with which the officiant has moved to the east[10] (i.e. to the āhavanīya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Whatever may be left in the ladle, with that he should offer. "And if the ladle should be turned topsyturvy, or if it should break, what rite

and what expiation would there be in that case?" The touching (expiation) for this has been treated.

Now there are also some people who return (to the gārhapatya) and ladle out (again). He should not do it thus. If any one should say in that case: "What he wished to achieve by that agnihotra, from that he has turned back. Therefore this (agnihotra) will not be conducive to heaven for him", it would indeed come to pass so.

He should proceed thus: where there is spilt, there he should sit down. They should bring him the pot and the *sruva* and *sruc* after having cleansed them. At that time (i.e. when the milk was first ladled out) there was said: "I shall ladle out" by him, but (now) he should (only) ladle out in the usual way (without a formula), take a firewood and go eastward (to the āhavanīya). As one may take strong action against one's enemies and finish them,[11] so he dispels the evil consisting of absence of subsistence and accomplishes the sacrifice. Some, however, seize (him) so to say (i.e. censure him)[12] on this point, saying: "There has not been offered by (or: for) him, for whom they offer with the remainder of the agnihotra milk. For this has been discarded". He should, however, not consider it thus. When that (remaining milk) is not discarded, they make it rennet for an oblation.[13]

NOTES

[1] *yadā vai skandaty atha dhīyate.* The double meaning of *skandati* "to spill"/"to emit seed" is utilized for this expiation. TB. 3, 7, 10, 3 f. bases its *ekakapālaskannaprāyaścitti* on a similar "wordplay" of *skandati* meaning "to be spilt" and "to leap, cover": *askān dyauḥ pṛthivīm askān ṛṣabho yuvā gāḥ skannemā viśvā bhuvanā skanno yajñaḥ prajanayatu askān ajani prājani āskannāj jāyate vṛṣā skannāt prajanişīmahi.* Compare the mantra *askann adhita prājani* in the ŚB. version of the present section. The fact that JB. omits *prājani* is not a strict proof that it has borrowed from ŚB., but again forms one of the many indications. See Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36, n. 47.

[2] *yonyām evaitad retaḥ pratiṣṭhāpayaty anuṣṭhyāsya retas siktaṃ prajāyate ya evaṃ veda.* Cf. JB. 3, 115 *yonir vai yajñasya cātvālaṃ reta āpo yonyām evaitad retaḥ* . . etc. The wording in both JB. passages corresponds completely. ŚB. differs on some points (e.g. *yonau*). Since the expiations are evidently borrowed from ŚB. and presumably belong to a late stage of JB., one may assume that these stock phrases were current in the circles of ŚB. as well as JB.

[3] *asya* here is a *genitivus pro dativo* ("to the benefit of", "for"). The seed which develops into offspring is not only his own seed, but includes all kinds of seed: rain, seed of animals etc. The spilling brings about (for him who knows thus) an increase of fertility in vegetation and procreation. The spilling though being unintentional is now turned into a magic rite producing

rain (principle of *similia similibus*) followed by vegetation and the emission of seed ("etymological" magic) followed by procreation.

[4] Eggeling translates *anuṣṭhyā* by "forthwith" (cf. Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 250 "sofort"). I reserve a detailed discussion of this term (which occurs also JB. 1, 8) for another occasion.

[5] The clause *upa mā devāḥ prābhūvan* does not occur in the ŚB. version, but is found ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 10 (rain falling on milk), where (unlike the present situation) it refers to an interference with the rite from outside by the gods, who send prosperity (in the form of rain) from above upon *(upa)* the sacrificer and thereby come near to him; help him *(upaprabhū-)*. Apparently JB. has mixed up two prāyaścittis, viz. the expiation for the spilling, which will (fut.!) produce rain and fertility, and the one for the falling of rain, in which the rain has fallen and the gods have already shown their aid (*upa .. prābhūvan*, an aorist referring to the immediate past).

[6] *bhūyasī me prajātir abhūd ..* (with a different word order in JB.) "(let him therefore know that) abundant production has accrued to him" (Eggeling). I take *abhūt* as a copula and *prajāti-* as "generative power, productivity", which refers to the potential, future production of sons, cattle and crop.

[7] *etā vai vyāhṛtayas sarvaprāyaścittayaḥ* (ŚB. — *iḥ*) "for these utterances are all-expiatory" (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "Or, perhaps, — these (great) utterances are used with the 'Sarvaprāyaścittam' (libation for expiating every mistake)". The compound has to be analysed as a tatpuruṣa: "expiations for all". Compare ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 11 ff., where the mahāvyāhṛtis are identical with the *sarvaprāyaścittam*. See also AB. 5, 32, 6 *saiṣā sarvaprāyaścittir yad etā vyāhṛtayaḥ;* JUB. 3, 4, 3, 3 *etā vai vyāhṛtayas sarvaprāyaścittayaḥ*. For a correct interpretation one has to consider the meaning of *sarva-* and the function of the *sarvaprāyaścitti*. For *sarva-* referring to the undivided whole, to completeness, etc. see Gonda, *Indian Linguistics* 16 (1955) *(= Chatterji Jubilee Vol.)*, p. 53 ff. The expiation does not, as some translators take it, concern everything (since for every particular mistake a particular expiation exists), but the indistinct totality. In case of doubt whether the error refers to *ṛc*, *yajus* or *sāman*, one uses the three vyāhṛtis as a means of expiation for "all without distinction" (AB. 5, 32, 5 f.; ŚB. 11, 5, 8, 6; JB. 1, 358; ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 17 (cf. 1, 5, 8); JUB. 3, 4, 3, 1 ff.; ChU. 4, 17, 4 ff.). For this indefiniteness expressed by *sarva-* see also ŚŚS. 3, 19, 8 *tatrobhe kuryāt sarvaprāyaścittaṃ cādhikārikaṃ ca* "he should perform both: the general atonement as well as the specially enjoined one" (tr. Caland). In the present context (the breaking of the *sthālī*) the *vyāhṛtis* representing the most perfect completeness, the three worlds, the universe, are supposed to restore the completeness, soundness, wholeness of the broken pot. Therefore the text continues *tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittiṃ kurute*. One expects, however, before *tad anena sarveṇa* an equation with *(idaṃ) sarvam* like ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *sarvaṃ vā anenaitad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittiṃ kurute*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *etā vai vyāhṛtaya idaṃ sarvaṃ tad enam anena sarveṇābhiṣiñcāma iti*. The equation required here would be *vyāhṛtis = idaṃ sarvam*.

[8] *tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittiṃ kurute* "he thus makes expiation with all this (Universe)" (Eggeling). How are we to understand this expiation by means of the Universe and what is the meaning of *idaṃ sarvam*? Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 91 a takes *idam* as an adverb ("tout ici-bas"). See also o.c., § 119 c "La disjonction *idam .. sarvam* confirme que le demonstratif est adverbe"; § 388 a (referring to ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 6 *tasmād yadaivāpo yanty athedaṃ sarvaṃ jāyate yad idaṃ kiṃ ca*) "La reprise de *idam* en écho confirme qu'il est adverbe". However, the occurrence of *idaṃ sarvam* in declined forms has

modified his view. See o.c. II, § 300 a "Le loc. *asmin .. sarvasmin* prouve que, dans une partie au moins de ses ex., la sequence *idaṃ sarvam* doit s'entendre "ce Tout" (= le monde entier, l'univers)". His arguments are not convincing, as may appear from ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 25 *anena sarveṇa .. yad idaṃ kiṃ ca*, where according to Minard's criterions the repetition would imply an adverb and the occurrence of a declined form indicate a pronoun. Like *ayam* (cf. *ayaṃ janaḥ* "this people, people here") *idam*, though being a congruing pronoun and, as such, declinable (*asmin sarvasmin* "in all this, in all here"), may be translated by an adverb in modern languages. The problem relates to *sarvam* rather than to *idam*. This term may refer to the All, the Universe, or to all, everything (to be regarded as the totality of all things) in other words the article is implied (German "das All") or not (German "alles"). In the first case *idam* brings out the implied article (Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 209) and *idaṃ sarvam* seems to denote "the All". It is represented as lying within the sphere or mental horizon of the speaker. Being the absolute totality *idaṃ sarvam* removes the antithesis of this *(ayam)* and yonder *(asau)* world. Similarly *idam* (adverb, "here") in cosmogonic passages does not refer exclusively to this sublunary world, but to the whole universe, within which the cosmos, as we know it now *(idam)*, is coming into existence. In the second case (*sarvam* = "all") *idam* at first sight seems to refer to the terrestrial sphere: "all this, all here (on earth)" (i.e. *sarvam* does not seem to have a cosmic meaning). Compare ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 6 *idaṃ sarvam .. yad idaṃ kiṃ ca* to AB. 1, 29, 4 *idam ... sarvaṃ havir yad idaṃ kiṃ ca*, and ŚB. 1, 3, 2, 16 *iyāṃ* (sc. the earth) *vā anuṣṭubh asyai vā idaṃ sarvam* to 1, 9, 3, 12 *asyāṃ hīdaṃ sarvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam*. But *idam* does not always limit the sphere of *sarvam* to the earth, as appears from ŚB. 1, 1, 3, 4 *vṛtro ha vā idaṃ sarvaṃ vṛtvā śiśye yad idam antareṇa dyāvāpṛthivī sa yad idaṃ sarvaṃ vṛtvā śiśye tasmād vṛtro nāma*. Apparently *idaṃ sarvam* was not a fixed, philosophical concept or special term for the universe in the brāhmaṇas. The difference between "all this" and "this All" seems to be only gradual. Often *(idaṃ) sarvam* denotes a totality which covers a limited sphere and which varies according to the contexts. Sometimes it refers to the terrestrial sphere, sometimes to special facets of, or domains in, this sphere — ŚāṅkhB. 3, 4 "in the spring all this is kindled" (vegetable kingdom); ŚB. 1, 9, 1, 28 *etāvad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yāvad dvipāc caiva catuṣpāc ca* (animal-kingdom and human beings) — , sometimes it covers such a complete totality as to coincide with our modern notion of the universe (ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *idaṃ sarvam* = the three vyāhṛtis = the three worlds = the Universe; ŚB. 2, 1, 4, 11 *etāvad vā idaṃ sarvaṃ yāvad ime lokāḥ*). Therefore *(idaṃ) sarvam* should neither invariably be translated by "the All, that All, the Universe" nor by "all this, all here". The less rigid approach, however, involves the risk of inconsistencies. Eggeling e.g. alternates "the All" with "everything" in similar contexts. For that matter, the latter translation should be avoided (see Gonda, *Indian Linguistics* 16, p. 64). Not the details as expressed by "everything", but the completeness of "all" is meant by *sarvam*. There seems to be a striving for totality or completeness in the brāhmaṇas: a complete life-time (not: long life), a complete sacrifice, etc. (see also Gonda, o.c., passim). This tendency is not only found in striving for deliverance (to become *sarvam*, to be freed from the limitations of the transitory individual; to obtain *sarvam*, to obtain the quarters of the universe and the year, i.e. to become one with the totality of space and time), but also in the ritualistic sphere with which we are concerned here. As was observed in the preceding note, *anena sarveṇa* should be based on the equation *vyāhṛtis = idaṃ sarvam* (replaced by *sarvaprāyaścittayaḥ*), the usual pattern

being: "x = *(idaṃ) sarvam*, so by means of *(idaṃ) sarvam* he performs this or that action". These stereotyped phrases are almost confined to ŚB. Only the phrase "x = *sarvam* (y = *sarvam*), so by *sarvam* he reaches *sarvam*" occurs six times in ŚāṅkhB. and once in GB. One may compare also GB. 2, 1, 3 *bṛhaspatir vai sarvaṃ brahma sarveṇa ha vā etad brahmaṇā* ("by the whole brahman") *yajñaṃ dakṣiṇata udyacchate*. It is striking that these phrases do not seem to be current in JB. as was shown in samples which I have taken from this text (there is no complete concordance). Once more evidence for borrowing from ŚB.?

For establishing the meaning of *anena sarveṇa* in these phrases three points may give a clue: a) the underlying identifications; b) the verbs of the contexts; c) parallel constructions. Point b does not yield much information. No homogeneity of the verbs is demonstrable. Any kind of (ritual) action can be performed *anena sarveṇa*. As to point a) one may especially note identifications of *sarvam* with *aniruktam* and *pūrṇam* (i.e. the indistinct completeness) and two or three times with *soma*, *saṃvatsara*, *sahasram* and *viśve devāḥ* (all symbolizing totality), whereas Prajāpati and other items are equated only once. With *idaṃ sarvam* the texts homologize *madhu* twice and the *vyāhṛtis* once. Furthermore *sarveṇa* sometimes occurs without a preceding equation or after the phrase *etāvad vā idaṃ* (sic) *sarvaṃ yāvad ime lokāḥ*, resp. *yāvad brahma kṣatraṃ viṭ*, etc. On the other hand *anena sarveṇa* is based once (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1) on an identification without *idam* (viz. *sarvaṃ vā aniruktam*). So the instrumentals *sarveṇa* and *anena sarveṇa* seem to be used without much difference. The *viśve devāḥ* are equated with *sarvam* (ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 22) as well as with *idaṃ sarvam* (ŚB. 3, 9, 1, 14). In these stereotyped phrases one has to reject the variety of meanings given by Eggeling which range from "with the Universe" to "with everything (required)". The underlying equations point to completeness, indistinct or undivided wholeness, totality. As to point c) one may compare ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 3 *sarvaṃ vai pūrṇaṃ sarveṇaivainam etac chamayati* ("by means of the All", tr. Eggeling) to l.c. *saṃtatam avyavachinnaṃ ninayati saṃtatenaivainam etad avyavachinnena śamayati* ("in a continuous, uninterrupted manner", tr. Eggeling). The occurrence of *anena sarveṇa* in the parallels preventing us from interpreting *sarveṇa* as "in a complete manner, completely", we have to translate for the sake of consistency *saṃtatena* "by means of the continuous, with continuity". That *sarveṇa* somehow refers to completeness, undivided wholeness, etc. seems to be beyond doubt here. Compare also ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 21 *sarvaṃ vā aniruktaṃ sarveṇaivaitad pratipadyate* to ŚB. 2, 3, 4, 9 *tad akṣayyeṇaivaitad bhūmnā pratipadyate* (pointing to fullness, completeness). To ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 22 *(sarvam = viśve devāḥ)* and 1, 9, 3, 5 *(sarvam = pūrṇam) sarveṇaivaitad saṃdadhāti* corresponds ŚB. 6, 4, 3, 1 ff. *yad vā asyai kṣataṃ yad viliṣṭam adbhir/vayunā/digbhir tat saṃdhīyate adbhir/vayunā/digbhir evāsyā etat kṣataṃ viliṣṭaṃ saṃtanoti saṃdadhāti*. So *sarveṇa* may refer to a concrete embodiment of the idea of completeness or wholeness (cf. *digbhiḥ*, the totality of space): the Whole, the All, the Universe. Eggeling translates ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 3 *(sarvam = pūrṇam)* and 2, 2, 1, 3 *(sarvam = aniruktam)* the instr. "by means of (with) the All", but ŚB. 2, 2, 1, 4 (*sarvam = varaḥ* "boon") in the same phrase *(sarveṇaivainam etac chamayati)* "with everything". Cf. ŚB. 9, 1, 2, 2 *yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātrā tāvataivainam etac chamayati* (Agni's *mātrā* is the universe). In these stock phrases the meaning of *(anena) sarveṇa* constantly seems to be the same ("the All, Completeness, Totality represented by the Universe"). The connotation of *sarvam* in the underlying equations may vary in accordance with the equated entities ("all this, all

here, the All"). Compare the parallel stock phrase "x = *agnir yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātrā tāvatā* he performs this or that action". In this instance the equation may refer to every kind of *agni* according to the equated entity, whereas in the conclusion only the *mātrā* of the omnipresent Agni (i.e. the universe) is mentioned. In the ritualistic expositions of the brāhmaṇas every ritual action is placed in a cosmic perspective, which implies that every part or ingredient of the sacrifice should be proved to be equal with the totality to which it belongs. One makes amends to Agni with all metres (ŚB. 9, 5, 1, 53). "So great is the extension of the metre; verily thus with the whole extension of the metre he gives oblation" (ŚāṅkhB. 3, 5 — tr. Keith). One gratifies Agni with all food: "that udumbara tree, indeed, (being) all the trees, is all food: he thus gratifies him (Agni) by every kind of food and kindles him by all trees (kinds of wood)" (ŚB. 6, 6, 3, 3 — tr. Eggeling), etc. etc. Eggeling's rendering "every kind of food" should be corrected into "all food". Cf. ŚB. 7, 2, 3, 3, *sarveṇaivāsminn etad annaṃ* (thus should be read instead of *anne*) *dadhāti; 7, 2, 2, 15 yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātrā tāvataivāsminn etad annaṃ dadhāti*. Putting food in somebody "with the All, the Whole, the Universe" means putting the complete totality of food which is found in the Universe in him. Cf. ŚB. 7, 2, 2, 13 *tad yac catasṛṣu dikṣv annaṃ tad asminn etad dadhāti*. That "all food" and not "every kind of food" is meant, confirms ŚB. 7, 2, 4, 25 *virāḍ u kṛtsnam annaṃ sarvam evāsminn etat kṛtsnam annaṃ dadhāti* "The Virāj is equal to the entire food; the whole, entire food he thereby places in him".

This striving for completeness is not restricted to equations with all metres, all food, etc., or to equations with the All regarded as the reservoir of all food; it may even culminate in a tendency to obtain by means of equations the All, the Universe, as the most suitable instrument for a complete (= successful) ritual action. See ŚB. 7, 2, 3, 4 *sarvasyo asyaiṣa raso yad ājyam .. asyaivainam etat sarvasya raseṇa prīṇāti yāvān u vai rasas tāvān ātmānenaivainam etat sarveṇa prīṇāti*, where *anena sarveṇa* seems to denote the All, the Universe. At the agnicayana this pursuing of completeness by means of the All is also manifest (ŚB. 10, 2, 1, 11). Thousand bricks are laid down. Thousand means all, thus with the All (i.e. with the utmost completeness embodied in the Universe, and hardly "with everything (required)", Eggeling's interpretation) one confers that highest form on Agni. There are three rows of bricks, Agni is threefold, thus one bestows that highest form on him with the *mātrā* of Agni (i.e. the All, the Universe, which forms Agni's *mātrā*). Eggeling removes the *anena sarveṇa* phrase in his translation of ŚB. 9, 3, 4, 17 *vāg vai sarasvatī tasyā idaṃ sarvaṃ yantraṃ savitṛprasūta evainam etad anena sarveṇa sarasvatyai vāco yantur yantreṇāgneḥ sāṃrājyenābhiṣiñcati* "for Sarasvatī is Vāc (speech), and hers in all this support. Impelled by Savitṛ he thus anoinst him by all this support of Sarasvatī Vāc, the supporter, and by the universal sovereignty of Agni". Evidently the *yantram* of Sarasvatī is equated with *idaṃ sarvam* ("all here" or rather "this All") on account of the equation Sarasvatī = Vāc. Therefore *yantreṇa* stands in apposition to *anena sarveṇa* ("with the All") just as *yantur* to *vāco*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *etā vai vyāhṛtaya idaṃ sarvaṃ tad enam anena sarveṇ ābhiṣiñcāma iti*. The turn of phrase *sarveṇaivaṃ tat sarvam āpnoti* (ŚB. 10, 2, 5, 16) does not have a profane meaning ("by means of everything he thus gains everything" — tr. Eggeling), but refers to obtaining the All (becoming or obtaining the totality of space or time, the year, means becoming complete and escaping death; see Gonda, o.c., p. 69) by means of the All, the Universe, Completeness itself. Cf. JB. 3, 318 *sa* (sc. Prajāpati) *etaṃ vyāptiṃ vyāpnot*

idaṃ sarvam abhavat etam eva vyāptiṃ vyāpnotīdaṃ sarvaṃ bhavati ya evaṃ veda. That besides the conception of completeness and totality (for which see Gonda, o.c.) incidentally also the idea of "sound, whole in body, unhurt" (Gonda, o.c., p. 69) may play a role, appears from the present passage as well as from ŚB. 14, 3, 2, 2 *sarvaṃ vai pūrṇaṃ sarveṇaivaitad bhiṣajyati yat kiṃ ca vivṛḍhaṃ yajñasya.*

[9] For *saṃcintya* read with Oertel and ŚB. *saṃcitya.*

[10] *prāca uddrutasya* must refer to the milk though in fact the officiant is walking to the east. Cf. JB. 1, 21 *upasṛṣṭam* (the milk while the cow and the calf are brought together) and *prakrāntam* (when the officiant has set out towards the āhavanīya; = *uddrutam*). For *skandati* with a *gen. partit.* see Oertel, *Syntax of Cases,* p. 128. Since the construction is not a *gen. abs.*, Caland's translation ĀpŚS. 9, 6, 1 *yady uddrutasya skandet* "Wenn die Milch übergeschüttet wird, nachdem er (n.l. der Adhvaryu oder wer immer das Agnihotra verrichtet) sich damit zum Āhavanīya hinbegeben hat" is confusing. For the absolute construction the loc. is used JB. 1, 57, where *uddrute* refers either to the priest or to the milk (cf. *adhiśrite*).

[11] Instead of *tad yathā pratyutthāyāmitrān paced* Oertel (observing: "the conjecture is only a makeshift") reads ... *mitrān* (thus his mss. and *ya, va, sa*) *vaded* ("perhaps *voced*?"). All the mss. read *paced* and this conjecture hardly makes sense. Consequently I retain the text of the critical edition. AB. 2, 20, 15 (to which Oertel refers) has *pratyuttiṣṭhati* with an acc. *(prati vai śreyāṃsam āyantam uttiṣṭhanti),* which might point to *mitrān* as the correct reading. Since the interpretation "As one might rise to meet friends and cook (them a meal)" would make a strange comparison, I take *pacati* here as "to bring to an end, to annihilate". Cf. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita* II (Calcutta 1936), p. 205, n. 16 (*vipacyate* "to come to an end"). The meaning of *pratyutthā-* may be either "to rise to meet (in battle)" or "to rise again". For *pratyutthā-* in the context of hostilities compare JB. 1, 179 (*Auswahl,* p. 70) *tān asurān etair evokthaiḥ pratyudatiṣṭhan* "Die Götter .. traten mit diesen Ukthas gegen die Asuras auf" (Caland) and JB. 3, 123 *kṛṣṇasarpa u haivainām pratyuttasthau* "Da erhob sich vor ihr eine schwarze Cobra" (Caland, *Auswahl,* p. 254), on which Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas,* p. 31 n. 11 observes that the verb *pratyutthā-* ("to rise for somebody") "is used here in inimical sense. Otherwise it signifies friendly greeting". The comparison seems to be: As in a battle one may get up (again) for a fresh attack on the enemies and destroy them in spite of an initial repulse, so the officiant gets up from his sitting position after the reverse (the spilling) and destroys the "spilling--enemy" (= *avṛttiṃ pāpmānam,* spilling magically implying the loss of all food) and obtains a complete victory *(= āhutiṃ prāpnoti).*

[12] Does *iva* ("so to say") in *upeva labhante* indicate that *upalabh-* here is used in an unusual sense? On account of the parallel version of ŚB. (*upavalhante* "some perplex him" — E.) and the context the meaning required here seems to be (as in classical Sanskrit) "to find fault with, to criticize, abuse, attack, take a firm line with".

[13] See VādhS. 4, 38 (*A.O.* 6, p. 150) *agnihotrocchiṣṭam ātacya nidadhyāt; tan mathitvā dīkṣaṇīyasyājye 'pikuryād* "Er lasse den Rest des Agnihotra (d.h. der für das A. bestimmten Milch) gerinnen und bewahre diesen auf; dann quirle er (am folgenden Tag) diesen Rest und tue ihn zu der Butter für die Dīkṣāṇīya-iṣṭi" (Caland).

55–56. *Something impure or rain falls on the milk*

For this third expiation compare especially ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2-4; 9-10. As to the relation between the two parallels one may first notice that the ŚB. version *(tad dhutam ahutam)* of the JB. clause *tan na hutaṃ nāhutam* is not found throughout the whole passage, but occurs only in connection with the pouring of the polluted milk on the coals (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 4). The fact that JB. explains this clause only at the end of 1, 55 (the parallel of ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 4) points to borrowing from ŚB. The latter text has *juhuyād* in the mentioned passage (against *ninayed* in the other paragraphs), whereas here JB. again equalizes the whole borrowed section by reading *ninayed* everywhere.

Instead of *teṣv evainat tūṣṇīṃ ninayet* (JB. 1, 55, second paragraph) ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 3 reads *tasminn enad uṣṇe bhasmaṃs tūṣṇīṃ ninayed.* One might explain the ŚB. version as an incorrect, careless repetition of the preceding paragraph (in which is stated that hot cinders are shifted out of the fire). On the other hand the JB. version, in which *teṣv* refers to the coals which just have been pushed back into the fire, would imply that the milk is offered in the (gārhapatya) fire. So presumably the ŚB. version is more original and one should assume that the pushing back of the coals leaves behind some hot cinders.

The ŚB. passage on the defilement of the milk which has been put on the fire (12, 4, 2, 4) differs from the preceding expiations on several points (*tān pratyūhya* is omitted; *tasminn enad uṣṇe bhasman* replaced by *teṣv enat; ninayet* replaced by *juhuyāt; tad dhutam ahutam* occurs only here). The JB. version hardly makes any distinction in respect to the other prāyaścittis dealing with the pollution. Replacing *dugdham* by *adhiśritam* and *adhiśrayiṣyan* by *adhiśritam* it repeats the whole preceding passage word for word. This does not only indicate that JB. has borrowed from ŚB. (as was observed above), but also that the borrowing and adaptation was made rather automatically. One may regard e.g. *tān eva pratyūhya* as a thoughtless repetition from the preceding passage since the pushing back of the coals is hardly compatible with the statement *yad v enāns teno evānugamayati* .. (coals pushed back into the fire are not extinguished by a milk offering). Moreover pushing back the coals while the milk is still *adhiśritam* is scarcely plausible from a practical point of view. These inconsistencies indicate that the borrowed prāyaścitti passage (in its transmitted form) was not put into practice; it was rather theoretical.

The ŚB. version is, however, not superior on all points. It quotes the same (twofold) view of the *eke* (12, 4, 2, 2 and 9) twice. JB. refers to two different (single) views (1, 55 and 56). In case the milk which is being milked becomes defiled one may hold that the gods are not loath of impurities (the view of *eke* JB. 1, 55; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2) and that therefore the milk may be prepared as an oblation. If the defilement takes place

after the milk has been ladled out into the *sruc* (ŚB.) or is being taken to the āhavanīya (JB.), a new argument should be adduced: the milk has been transformed into an oblation, fit and ready to be offered; it is on its way to the āhavanīya and should not be obstructed, it is *prayata-* or *preta-* (JB. 1, 56; ŚB, 12, 4, 2, 9). Compare also the spilling expiation, where it is explicitly stated that after the ladling out of the milk the rite has to go on (one is not allowed to return to the gārhapatya; the point of no return has been passed). Therefore the quotation of the view of *eke: prayatam etan naitasyāhomo 'vakalpate* is out of place at ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2. It may have been inserted there for the sake of parallelism with 12, 4, 2, 9, where *na vai devāḥ kasmāc cana bībhatsante* has been repeated from 12, 4, 2, 2. The incidental occurrence of a preferable version in JB. does not imply that ŚB. has borrowed from JB. since even the ŚB. text may be corrupt at times and the corruption is easily explained here.

The expiation for the defilement of the milk of ŚB. seems to be based on AB. 7, 5, 1 *(agnihotram adhiśritam amedhyam āpadyeta) .. uttarata āhavanīyasyoṣṇam bhasma nirūhya juhuyān manasā vā prājāpatyayā varcā. tad dhutaṃ cāhutaṃ ca.* The *eke* who make the impurity flow off (JB. 1, 56; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9) may be the Aitareyins: *tac ced vyapanayituṃ śaknuyān niṣṣicyaitad duṣṭam aduṣṭam abhiparyāsicya* .. etc.

A rather different expiation occurs KS. 35, 18-19 (= KapS. 48, 16-17) and TB. 3, 7, 2, 2 *yat kiṭāvapannena juhuyāt.* The younger Taitt. follow TB. (BŚS. omits this expiation). ĀśvŚS., the Mānavas and AthPr. 4, 3 (using a different mantra) agree with KS. 35, 19. AthPr. 1, 3 *(yasyāgnihotre 'medhyam āpadyeta)*, seems to be based on AB. 7, 5, 1. For the several kinds of impurities which may fall into an oblation see von Negelein, o.c., n. 257.

The meaning of this expiation is clear. The milk has become impure and is therefore unfit for the oblation. Most texts refrain, however, from the usual procedure for removing impure material by pouring it into water (cf. von Negelein, o.c., n. 58). Being an oblation ready to be offered it should remain within the sphere of the sacrifice. The pouring on the ashes ensures the continuity of the sacrificial operation as well as the neutralization of the impure material. The sacrifice is saved *(tad dhutam)* and the gods do not receive an oblation which they might loathe *(tad ahutam)*, or in accordance with the (less theological) magico-ritualistic way of reasoning the sacrificer's life and interests are not threatened (cf. KS. and TB.: *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt*). The Taitt. pour the milk within the enclosing sticks (cf. KS. 35, 18: 64. 9 f.). The pouring on an ant-hill may have the same function of retaining the oblation for the sacrifice: *prājāpatyayarcā valmīkavapāyām avanayet prājāpatyo vai valmīko yajñaḥ prajāpatir yajña eva yajñaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati* (KS. 35, 19: 66. 1 f.).

Now it is remarkable that the falling of an insect into the milk and the boiling over seem to require related expiations in TB. (3, 7, 2, 2), which remarks in both cases *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt* (sc. if he would offer that milk) *yad anāyatane ninayet* (i.e. if he would not somehow retain it for the sacrifice) *anāyatanaḥ syāt.* He should pour the milk

with the insect within the enclosing sticks *(madhyamena parṇena dyāvāpṛthivyayarcāntaḥparidhi ninayet)*; in case the milk boils over, he should pour it on an ant-hill (TB. 3, 7, 2, 1 *prājāpatyayarcā valmīkavapāyām avanayet*). The younger Taitt. agree with TB. and use the mantras *prajāpate na tvad etāny* .. (at the boiling over) and *mahī dyauḥ pṛthivī* (if an insect falls into the milk). ĀśvŚS. 3, 11, 20, however, prescribes the latter mantra at the boiling over of the milk (which is poured upon the ashes near the āhavanīya; cf. the *amedhyam* expiation) and the former at the falling of an insect in the milk (in this case the milk is poured on the ant-hill instead of within the enclosing sticks). MŚS. 3, 2, 7 uses the mantras as ĀśvŚS., but mentions the pouring on the ant-hill and within the enclosing sticks as alternatives in both cases. The palāśa leaf used by the Taitt. and ĀśvŚS. for the insect has been transferred from this expiation to the boiling over of the milk by the Mānavas and is also applied by HirŚS. (apparently the latest of the three younger Taitt.) to the wrong expiation. This mixing up of the two expiations in the sūtras is not based on any intrinsic agreements between the two accidents to be expiated, but on a corruption in the oldest sources. KS. 35, 18-19 (= KapS. 48, 16-17) has a double treatment of the expiation *yat kīṭāvapannena juhuyāt*, a fact which in itself is already suspicious. In the one version (35, 18: 64. 8 ff.) one should pour with the palāśa leaf within the enclosing sticks, in the other (35, 19: 65. 13 ff.) (without the leaf) upon an ant-hill. TB. rightly splits this expiation into two different ones. One may doubt, however, whether the clause *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt* (occurring in both versions of the *kīṭāvapannam* expiation in KS.) should refer to the *kīṭāvapannam* as well as the *visyannam* expiation in TB. Why should the falling of an insect into the milk imply that offering that milk means loss of progeny and cattle? That the loss of milk due to boiling over would bring about the loss of progeny and cattle is, however, very plausible since the agnihotra milk represents the sacrificer, his life (in the full sense of the word), his interests. So we are to infer that in the corrupt KS. passage the *viṣyannam* expiation has dropped out of the text, but has left traces in the form of the double occurrence of the clause *aprajā apaśur* .. and of one of the two versions of the *kīṭāvapannam* expiation. It seems that TB. has adopted the wrong version of the two for its *kīṭāvapannam* expiation. The milk into which an insect has fallen is impure and therefore should be poured upon the ant-hill (see von Negelein, o.c., n. 741). The boiling over of the milk, however, does not cause impurity, but may be regarded as a kind of spilling (as is done by AB. 7, 5, 2). This milk is disqualified for offering and is therefore poured out within the enclosing sticks. So the corruption of the KS. passage seems to have brought about the confusion of the two expiations. Remarkably ĀśvŚS. and to some extent MŚS. and AthPr. have the correct version of the *kīṭāvapannam* expiation.

The falling of rain on the milk has been taken together with the defilement of the milk in one expiation by JB. For the same combination compare KS. 35, 19 (= KapS. 48, 17) and TB. 3, 7, 2, 3. On the other hand JB. and ŚB. consider raining to be auspicious (see e.g. the spilling

expiation JB. 1, 53). Perhaps the two expiations are combined in JB. due to the fact that they are successive in the source, ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9-10.

The other texts prescribe that the milk should be offered with a mantra dedicated to Mitra (*mitro janān yātayati* .. ṚV. 3, 59, 1; TS. 3, 4, 11) and observe: *mitro vai yajñasya śāntir mitreṇaivainaṃ śamayati* (TB.: *mitreṇaivainat kalpayati*). A new cow should be milked and a new oblation be made. See Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 40 f., whose interpretation that "a foreign power wants to disturb the sacrifice" and that Mitra "who gives all the powers their places (√yat- or √klp-) and who thus controls them, is the god who is also able to check the activity of this power which disturbs the sacrifice (śam-)" is not convincing in all respects. Neither rain itself nor the givers of rain are evil powers. The falling of rain though connected with the falling of impurities in the context does not cause an ordinary defilement. If one should offer that milk *aparūpam asyātmañ jāyeta* (KS. 35, 19: 65. 7) "his body would become deformed". TB. explains this as *kilāso vā syād aŕśaso vā* "he would become suffering from leprosy or haemorrhoids". Apparently the rain-drops on the milk oblation (to be regarded as the sacrificer himself) will bring about white or grey spots (or ulcers) on the body of the sacrificer, who will suffer from the mentioned diseases. Since non-offering of this oblation or returning to the gārhapatya is excluded, one offers that milk with the mantra to Mitra in order that Mitra, who settles, orders, arranges all in this universe *(yātayati|kalpayati)* and appeases or straightens out the sacrifice *(mitro vai yajñasya śāntiḥ)* may appease or fix *(śamayati)* or order *(kalpayati)* this questionable sacrifice. Water as such not being impure and even admissible as an addition to the milk the function of Mitra (the supervisor and regulator of all sorts of contacts between human beings, parties or other entities, rather than someone's "friend") may also be promoting the fusion between the milk and the heavenly fluid, i.e. the putting together of fluids from two different spheres and the dissolving of the drops into the milk. The younger Taitt. follow TB.; ĀśvŚS. and AthPr. agree with KS.

55. Now they say: "If into the agnihotra milk of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, something impure should fall[1] while it is being milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Some opine that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "Surely the gods have no loathing[2] for anything". He should, however, not consider it thus. Does man, indeed, loathe from the loathful, loathing even is found with gods.[3] He should proceed thus: Having pushed[4] some hot cinders out of the gārhapatya he should silently pour that (milk) on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered.[5] He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains[6] that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now further they say: "If something impure should fall into it after it has been milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having pushed back the coals on which he was going to put it he should silently pour it on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk).

Now further they say: "If something impure should fall into it after it has been put on the fire, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having pushed back the coals on which it has been put he should silently pour it on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered. That[7] he pours it on them, thereby it is offered; that by means of it he extinguishes them,[8] thereby it is unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now they further say:

56. "If something impure should fall into the milk with which the officiant has moved eastward (i.e. to the āhavanīya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some opine that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "It is already on its way,[9] it is not suitable to offer it not". And some pour (the impurity) away[10] by pouring water on to it. He should, however, not do it thus. If any one should say in that case: "He has poured away this agnihotra milk, this sacrificer will be poured away",[11] it would come to pass so. He should proceed in this way: Having put a firewood on the āhavanīya and having pushed some hot cinders out of the āhavanīya he should silently pour that (milk) on them. Thereby it is neither offered, nor unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now further they say: "If rain should fall upon it, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should consider: " 'Light' has come to me from above.[12] My generative power has been increased. I shall become more prosperous"[13] (and) it would come to pass so.[14]

NOTES

[1] *agnihotram .. amedhyam āpadyeta* does not mean "If any one's Agnihotra-milk were to become impure" (Eggeling), but as E. hesitatingly proposes in his footnote "If anything impure were to get (fall) into any one's Agnihotra-milk". See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 593 a. Cf. also AthPr. 1, 3 *agnihotre 'medhyam āpadyeta;* ŚB. 1, 2, 5, 26 *kiṃ cid āpadyeta.*

[2] For *bībhatsa iti* (thus all mss.) I read with Oertel and the ŚB. version *bībhatsanta iti*.

[3] Oertel's reading *puruṣo neva bībhatseyād bībhatsate bībhatsantāïtu devāḥ* seems to imply a contrast of non-loathing human beings and loathing gods, which hardly suits the context. Moreover *iva* in *neva* is difficult to explain (according to D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva, thesis Marburg 1970, p. 16 *neva* could mean "noch nicht" in ŚB. 1, 6, 4, 7). For his *tu* the ŚB. version *bībhatsantā3i tu devāḥ* is not a real parallel since in ŚB. *tu* (together with the pluti) expresses the rejection of the assumption *na vai devāḥ kasmāc cana bībhatsante*. In JB. *bībhatsantāï* (whatever may be the correct reading a pluti should be assumed) forms an antithetical, complementary pair with *bībhatsate*. Raghu Vira reads (with many question-marks in the crit. app.) *nveva* and *bībhatsantāï3 devāḥ* (mss.: *bībhatsāntāïdu; bībhatsāṃtām udu*). I suggest reading *bībhatsantā3 id u devāḥ*. For the sandhi of *ā3i* before vowels see Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* I, p. 229. The particles *nv eva* may be used in the first of two antithetical clauses (Macdonell, *Vedic Gr. f. St.*, p. 239) and *id u* emphasizing preceding words (including finite verb forms) may be translated by "even". Cf. *sadṛśīr adya sadṛśīr id u svaḥ* (Macdonell, o.c., p. 218). The pluti underlines the antithetical structure of the sentence.

[4] For *nirūhya* and *pratyūhya* of the crit. ed. (see also Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64) compare AB. 7, 5, 1; TB. 2, 1, 3, 1 and most sūtras. Oertel and the ŚB. version read *niruhya* and *pratyuhya*. Cf. KŚS. 4, 14, 2; ŚŚS. 2, 8, 8; 15.

[5] *tan na hutaṃ nāhutam* (ŚB. version *tad dhutam ahutam*). Cf. TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 *tan neva hutaṃ nevāhutam*. For the problem of offering and non-offering see ŚB. 13, 2, 4, 3 and Arbman, *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus* (thesis Uppsala 1922), p. 51.

[6] See the introduction to the preceding section on this "etymological" magic.

[7] *aha* is not an explicative particle (Eggeling: "for"), but expresses together with *u* in the next clause a slight antithesis. See Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 520.

[8] Eggeling's translation of *yad v enāns tenaivānugamayati* "inasmuch as he extinguishes it along with them" is puzzling. The extinction of the coals implies that no oblation has been offered, offering consisting in the burning of an oblation.

[9] Oertel's conjecture *prayatam* (the reading of ŚB.) for *pretam* is superfluous, if one takes *preta-* ("advanced"; transferred from the rite which has proceeded, or from the priest who has started for the āhavanīya, to the milk itself, cf. *uddruta-*) as a correct equivalent of *prayatam* meaning "(already) presented", "all but offered as an oblation" (i.e. too far advanced in the sacrificial procedure to be withheld). Perhaps also *prayatam* has been misinterpreted as **prayātam* by the JB. For the exchange of *prayata* and *preta* also compare Section 12-14, n. 12 (on *prayati-* and *preti-*).

[10] JB. has replaced *chardayanti* (ŚB.; "they make the milk spit it out") by the colourless *parāsiñcanti*, which anticipates *parāñ .. asiñcat* (ŚB. *parāsiñcata*).

[11] Cf. ŚB. 1, 5, 2, 15 *yathā pūrṇapātram parāsiñced evaṃ ha sa yajamānam parāsiñcet;* 13, 1, 6, 3 *parā vā eṣa sicyate yo 'balo 'śvamedhena yajati* (where the context does not deal with the pouring of liquids, which proves that *parāsiñcati* is metaphorically used in ŚB. and means "to annihilate, sweep away").

[12] *upariṣṭān mā śukram āgann* (JB. *āgāt*) "Light (or sap) has come to me

from above" (Eggeling). Here "sap" would be suitable, but JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2, dealing with the mingling of the fires) requires a different translation. See also ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4 (lightning hits the fire). Because of the three contexts "light", especially in its figurative sense of "help", seems to be the required meaning.

[13] For this passage of three clauses see also JB. 1, 53 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7), JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2) and ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4. In all the contexts the third clause runs *śreyān bhaviṣyāmi*. In all the ŚB. passages except 12, 4, 1, 7 *upa māṃ devāḥ prābhūvan* forms the second clause. In JB. this clause is only found in the spilling expiation (1, 53), where it seems to be used secondarily (as first clause). ŚB. does not apply this phrase in the spilling expiation. The original version may have been *upa riṣṭān mā śukram āgann, upa māṃ devāḥ prābhūvañ, chreyān bhaviṣyāmi*, with as a secondary variant *parastān mā* .. In the JB. version *prajātir me bhūyasy abhūt* (second clause) has been taken from the spilling expiation (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7) and has superseded *upa mā devāḥ prābhūvan* (incorrectly transposed to the spilling expiation, where consequently the original *bahuḥ prajayā paśubhir bhaviṣyāmi* has been omitted).

[14] *tathā haiva syāt*, the usual apodosis after a protasis introduced by *yo ha tatra brūyāt* or variants (JB. 1, 52; 54; 56; 61), is rather odd here and in the JB. parallels (mentioned in n. 13). Does the optative *vidyāt* have a potential rather than a prescriptive force here ("he might know or consider .. [and if he would do so] it would come true)?

56. (last paragraph). *The fire of the coals goes out after the first oblation has been offered*

For this expiation compare ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 1, where it starts a new chapter on the extinction of fires. Its position in JB., where it neither begins with the stock phrase *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ* .., which introduces new, independent expiations, nor even starts a new chapter, can only be explained by the fact that in ŚB., its source, it also follows the rainfall expiation.

Instead of *dārau dārau hy agniḥ* the ŚB. version has *dārau dārāv agnir iti vadan dārau dārau hy evāgniḥ*. The sūtras (BŚS. 28, 12; BhārŚS. 9, 3, 12; ĀpŚS. 9, 2, 8; HirŚS. 15, 1, 47; VaiŚS. 20, 5; MŚS. 3, 2, 9) have taken the words *dārau dārāv agnir* as a yajus and read *agnir dārau dārāv agniḥ* (Bhār. even adds *agāt svāhā*). The cause of this reinterpretation seems to be the correspondence to the agnihotra formula *agnir jyotir jyotir agniḥ* and the fact that *vadan* (ŚB.) was misunderstood. In these expiations *vadantaḥ* frequently occurs with the meaning "reasoning, arguing" rather than "saying, reciting". Due to this reinterpretation the oblation is not offered on any piece of wood which may be available (Agni being present in every piece of wood according to ŚB./JB.), but on a wood-block in the fire (in contrast to ŚB., where a piece of wood from outside has to be put on the fire: *abhyasya*!) which is lying nearest to the extinguished *samidh* (Bhār. *antame śakale*; Āp. *anantare śakale*). Apparently this explicit mentioning of the nearest piece of wood (not occurring in all the sūtras) is only to be explained as a relic of the brāhmaṇa version, where *prativeśa-* (see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 72, p. 4) and *antika-* meaning "lying on hand, being present and near, available" makes sense in connection with the statement *dārau dārāv agniḥ*. If no wood from outside is put on the fire, one may ask why there should be offered on a *śakala* (and not on a *samidh*) and why this *śakala* should be *anantara-* or *antama-*.

According to ĀśvŚS. 3, 14, 23 the oblation should be offered on a piece of gold (compare the present section). This text does not mention the offering on a piece of wood.

56 (last paragraph). Now further they say: "If, after the first oblation has been offered, the coals should become extinct, where should he offer the second?" Having thrown[1] on the fire any log of wood which may be lying near there he should offer (on it). For in every piece of wood there is fire (or: Agni). If he should have no confidence[2] in this (expiation), he should offer upon gold.[3] Now gold is the seed of Agni[4] and the father is identical with the son. Therefore he should offer upon gold.

Now further they say:

NOTES

[1] In view of ŚB. *abhyasya* one may prefer *adhyasya* to *adhyasyan* (thus the crit. ed. and Oertel).

[2] *sa yadi tasyāṃ na tiṣṭhed*. The meaning of *sthā* with loc. is not "to abide by", "to be satisfied with" (thus Oertel, o.c., p. 338, n. 10 referring to AB. 7, 18, 4), but "to rely on" (cf. *Petr. Dict.*, s.v.: 14 *mayi sthitvā*).

[3] The gold represents the fire. See von Negelein, o.c., n. 800 quoting BrahmPr. 46 b *agnisaṃpādanārthaṃ hiraṇyaṃ nidhāya*.

[4] Cf. ŚB. 2, 1, 1, 5 *tad dhiraṇyam abhavat tasmād etad agnisaṃkāśam agner hi retas*.

57. *The death of the agnihotrin during the rite*

ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 5) offers a parallel only for the death of the sacrificer after the milk has been put on the fire *(adhiśritam)*. In JB. these expiations form a separate chapter, which is not introduced by the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ* .. always occurring at the beginning of a new, independent expiation. This special expiation in which the sacrificer himself forms the subject did not allow this stereotyped phrase.

For the first expiation *(paryādhāyaivainad viṣyandayet)* compare ŚB. *tad eva inad abhiparyādhāya viṣyandayet* "Having enclosed it, let him pour it out" (Eggeling); AB. 7, 2, 2 *tad āhur ya āhitāgnir adhiśrite 'gnihotre sāṃnāyye vā haviṣṣu vā mriyeta kā tatra prāyaścittir ity atraivaināny anuparyādadhyād yathā sarvāṇi saṃdahyeran* "(..) He should put all around so that they may all be burned together" (Keith); AthPr. 2, 9 *atha yo 'dhiśrite 'gnihotre yajamāno mriyeta katham tatra kuryāt tatra ivaitat paryādadhyād yathā sarvaśaḥ saṃdahyetety athāhavanīya ājyāhutiṃ juhuyāt* "(..) One should pour out the agnihotra-milk in such a manner that it burns out completely" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 164). The parallels prove that *tad eva* in ŚB. (not translated by Eggeling) should mean "there, on the spot" (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tadevopaviśed*) i.e. "on the gārhapatya (on which the pot has been placed)". Compare KŚS. 25, 7, 7 ff. (not exclusively referring to the agnihotra): "If the sacrificer dies after the preparation of the oblation but before the placing of the oblation within the altar, one should burn out the oblation on the gārhapatya fire. If the sacrificer dies after the placing of the oblation, one should burn out the oblation on the āhavanīya fire" *(Śrautakośa* I, p. 472). Keith likewise does not render *tatraiva* and moreover wrongly takes *sarvāṇi* as "all" (referring to all kinds of offerings mentioned in this expiation?) instead of "in their totality, completely" (cf. AthPr. *sarvaśaḥ*). The pot on the gārhapatya is surrounded on all sides with fuel and fire so that *(yathā)* the milk or the other oblatory material burns out entirely. In the case of the milk one makes it boil over *(viṣyandayati)*; thus i tis burnt in the additional fire put around the pot. This burning of the milk seems to represent a cremation of the sacrificer, who is identical with the oblation.

The two other expiations of this section have no parallels in the brāhmaṇas. For the death of the agnihotrin after the first libation has been offered see ĀpŚS. 9, 11, 20 (referring to JB.?).

57. "If the sacrificer should die after the agnihotra milk has been put on (the gārhapatya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having surrounded it with fire he should make it boil over. This is the rite in that case. And this is indeed also the

expiation for all the *haviryajñas* (in case the sacrificer would die).

Now they further say: "If the sacrificer should die after the officiant has moved with the milk to the east (i.e. to the āhavanīya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" What is appointed to be ladled out four times on that occasion,[1] to that he should pour that (milk) on. This is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If the sacrificer should die after the first oblation has been offered, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some hold that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "The whole agnihotra is[2] offered by him who has offered the first oblation". He should, however, not consider it thus. One does[2] not offer the agnihotra for a deceased. What is appointed to be ladled out four times on that occasion,[1] to that he should pour that (milk) on. This is the rite in that case.

NOTES

[1] *yad evādayaś caturgṛhītam ādiṣṭaṃ syāt* (crit. ed.) does not make sense. Oertel conjectures *evātaś*, the reading of one of his manuscripts in the next paragraph, where *ya*, *ra* and *sa* read *evādaś*. This *evādaś* may be the correct reading if our interpretation of the rite is correct. The milk seems to be poured on the *caturgṛhītam* oblation which is prescribed "there, on that (other) occasion, i.e. at the death and funeral of the sacrificer". For the use of the milk from the agnihotra at the pitṛmedha see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 7 and ĀpŚS. 9, 11, 20. For the meaning of *adas* required here see JB. 1, 54 (see introduction of section 53-54); ŚB. 7, 1, 2, 10. Here *tatraiva* seems to stand for *tasminn eva* (referring to *yad .. caturgṛhītam*).

[2] The pres. indic. *bhavati* and (in the next sentence) *na .. juhoti* express a prescription. Compare English "one does not ..", i.e. "one should not .."

58–59. *The cow sits down while being milked*

For this section compare ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 9-10. The expiation is found also MS. 1, 8, 8; TB. 1, 4, 3, 1 ff.; AB. 7, 3, 1 f.

First ŚB. and JB. refer to the view of *eke* who make the cow rise. These are the Taittirīyas, whose explanation of the *yajus* to be recited on that occasion is partly identical to that quoted by ŚB. with *iti vadantaḥ*. The JB. version inserting the statement *avṛttiṃ vā eṣā yajamānasya* .. (occurring at the end of the passage in TB. and ŚB.) directly after *utthāpayanti* thereby separates *yajuṣā* from the quotation of the yajus *ud asthād devy aditir* .. and consequently has to repeat *tām utthāpayanti*. ŚB., the source of JB., on some points agrees more than JB. with the freely quoted TB. text, but once JB. seems to have been directly influenced by TB. (as well as ŚB.):

3. *avartiṃ vā eṣaitasya pāpmānam pratikhyāya niṣīdati*
3. *avṛttiṃ vā eṣā yajamānasya pāpmānam pratidṛśyopaviśati*
3. *ārtiṃ vā eṣā pāpmānaṃ yajamānasya pratidṛśyopaviśati.*
3. *yasyāgnihotry upasṛṣṭā niṣīdati.*
3. *yasyāgnihotrī duhyamānopaviśati.*

The parallel versions of ŚB. and JB. reading *pratidṛśya* prove that TB. *pratikhyāya* should not be interpreted with Dumont as "en proclamant" (cf. *Śrautakośa* I, p. 154 "declaring"), but as "foreseeing" (Keith, *Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 252 in his translation of AB. 5, 27, 6 which deals with the expiation for the lowing of the cow). Compare also AthPr. 2, 4 *aśanāpipāse evaiṣā yajamānasya saṃprakhyāya vāśyati* (..) *bhayaṃ vā eṣā yajamānasya* (von Negelein, o.c., p. XIX "Nun, sie brüllt, weil sie des Opferveranstalters Hunger und Durst ansagen will"). Allthough *prakhyāti* (unlike *pratikhyāti*) may be taken as "to announce", the use of the gerund (mostly expressing an action passed prior to the action of the finite verb) is in favour of the other interpretation.

As was observed above, ŚB. and JB. do not verbally quote the TB. passage in their reference to the view of *eke*. On the one hand the rather forced explanations of pādas c-d of the mantra are not found in TB., which only states *yathāyajur evaitad*. On the other hand ŚB. and JB. omit the identification cow = earth, which occurs in their source (TB. 1, 4, 3, 2 *iyaṃ vā agnihotrī*, followed by the equation *iyaṃ vai devy aditiḥ*), and thereby lack an important link in their argument. The cow is the earth, Aditi is the earth, therefore the earth is raised (i.e. they rouse the earth to a greater production?) by the verse *ud asthād devy aditiḥ* (and by the actual raising of the cow). For an identification of Aditi and cow (which is not expressed here) see ŚB. 2, 3, 4, 34; 14, 2, 1, 7. According to TB. the cow should be given away after the milking. ŚB. has *tasyām āhutyām* "at this offering" (Eggeling) and JB. has the (presumably preferable) prescription that the cow should be given after the

milk has been offered *(tasyām evāhutau hutāyām)*. As to the giving away of the cow AB. only precribes that the receiver should be a brahmin, whereas TB. specifies *yasyānnaṃ nādyāt*. ŚB. freely quotes this as *yam anabhyāgamiṣyan manyeta*. The limitation to one year as found in the JB. version *(yaṃ saṃvatsaram anabhyāgamiṣyanto bhavanti)* may be a later mitigation of the expiation. Compare ĀśvŚS. 3, 11, 2, where only the milk and not the (more expensive) cow is given to a brahmin *yasyābhokṣyan syāt yāvajjīvaṃ saṃvatsaraṃ vā*.

After quoting the view of *eke* ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 10 f. puts forward an own interpretation of this sitting down of the cow by introducing two teachers who frequently play a role in ŚB., viz. Yājñavalkya and Āruṇi, and representing their opinion. Here JB. obviously borrows the ŚB. passage. It calls Yājñavalkya the Vājasaneya. Moreover the view of Āruṇi (ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11), who is rather sceptical of several expiations among which the sitting down of the cow is mentioned as the last and most important (therefore ŚB. considers this passage together with the preceding paragraph as dealing with the same expiation), has been transformed into a new expiation. JB. 1, 60 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11) starts with the stock phrase which introduces a new expiation. Retaining the secondary division of the text as made by JB. itself we deal with JB. 1, 60 *(agnihotrīvatso naśyet)* in a separate section. That JB. 1, 59 and 60, however, originally form a unity does not appear only from the parallel and source ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 10 f., but also from some inconsistencies in the JB. text itself. The last sentence of JB. 1, 59 *(tām ātmann eva kurvītātmann eva tac chriyaṃ dhatta iti)* absolutely does not fit in the context, which nowhere refers to *śrī*. The ŚB. version of this chapter (12, 4, 1, 10) does not have this sentence, but in the next paragraph it is found in a quite suitable context; it is preceded by *śriyo vai parjanyo varṣati ..; śremāṇam me ... adhārayamāṇā ..; śreyān bhaviṣyāmi*. In the JB. parallel (1, 60) these references are missing. Therefore and because JB. had transformed this passage into a new expiation *(agnihotrīvatso naśyet)*, the conclusion *tām ātmany eva kurvītātmany eva tac chriyaṃ dhatta iti* could not be placed at the end of JB. 1, 60 and consequently had to be transferred to the end of 1, 59. In that position *tām ātmann eva kurvīta* is suitable to some extent, but the argumentation *ātmann eva tac chriyaṃ dhatte* can only be explained as a clumsy borrowing from ŚB.

In the Jaiminīya version of Yājñavalkya's view *avṛttyā hi taṃ vidhyanti* seems to be a corruption of ŚB. (12, 4, 1, 10) *ārtyo vā āhutiṃ vidhyanti* "and they smite the offering with trouble" (Eggeling). Is *(avṛtty)ā hi taṃ* based on *āhutiṃ*? The clearest proof of borrowing is procured by the automatical replacement of *ārtyā* (which is in no way connected with *ārtiṃ .. pāpmānam* in the preceding brāhmaṇam; cf. JB. *avṛttim ... pāpmānam*) by *avṛttyā*. Consequently (offerings not being smitten with absence of livelihood) *āhutiṃ* had to be dropped. The criticism put foreward by Yājñavalkya (in ŚB.) is: a) They lose a (or the cow) only because they lack faith or confidence, i.e. needlessly. b) They frustate the offering only because of their lack of faith, i.e. they

have needlessly made an expiation and thereby make a failure of this sacrifice. For *ārtyā* in connection with *vidhyati* denoting the frustating of a sacrifice compare JB. 2, 221 *tān yajñasyārtyāvidhyat* "Dieser traf sie, indem er ihr Opfer störte" (Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 183). In the reinterpretation (or corruption) of JB. *tam* may refer either to *gauḥ* (then the sing. masc. should quite unusually mean "cattle"), or to the brahmin to whom they transfer the *avṛtti pāpman*, which is hardly a better solution. Why should smiting a brahmin with absence of livelihood be the reason *(hi)* that the cow (or cattle) passes away from them *aśraddadhānebhyaḥ*?

The development of this expiation seems to be the following. In the oldest text (MS.) the cow sits down not bearing the sacrificer's suffering *(avartim .. yajamānasyānutsahya)* and is given to a brahmin *(yasyānnaṃ nādyāt)* together with the *avarti*. TB. follows MS., but adds the raising of the cow with the yajus *ud asthād* .. (occurring also in AB.), which introduces a new interpretation: the cow is the earth. Thus two approaches of the accident are mixed up. In TB. the conclusion is not yet drawn that the cow being the earth cannot be given away. According to AB. the mantra *yasmād bhiṣā niṣīdasi* .. should be recited (not found in the parallel brāhmaṇas), the cow should be raised with *ud asthād* .. (cf. TB.), water should be put or held under her udder and mouth (*athāsyā udapātram ūdhasi ca mukhe copagṛhṇīyād*; the bowl is hardly placed on the udder and mouth, as Keith interprets *upagṛh-*) and the cow should be given away. ŚB. rejects the TB. expiation by quoting the views of two well-known teachers referring to the two aspects of this prāyaścitti. Yājñavalkya (12, 4, 1, 10) deals only with the old version (the cow sitting down in distress), which he replaces by a more positive and optimistic interpretation. Āruṇi, however, considers (12, 4, 1, 11) the cosmic aspect of the rite (as was already done by TB. in its equation *agnihotrī* = earth) and concludes on account of his own identifications (*agnihotrī* = heaven; *agnihotrasthālī* = earth) that the cow should not be given away since it brings prosperity. He might as well have said (cf. *kva hy asau naśyet*; *kva hīyaṃ bhidyeta*) *kva hy asau dīyeta* "where should it be given away?". Among the sūtras BŚS. and BhārŚS. completely agree with TB., whereas the two later Taitt. ĀpŚS. (9, 5, 2 ff.) and HirŚS. (15, 2, 1 ff.) show influences from AB. by the *abhimantraṇa* of the cow with *yasmād bhiṣā niṣīdasi* (Āp. *nyasadaḥ*). This mantra also occurs TB. 3, 7, 8, 1 (in the Āp. version), but the relevant expiation is missing in TB. These sūtras mention the expiation of ŚB. (JB.) as an alternative. Perhaps *tām ātmann eva kurvīta* especially refers to the JB. version (1, 59; ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11 has *tām ātmany eva kurvīta*). Moreover the cow is fed (like the lowing cow AB. 7, 3, 3; ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 12) with grass (cf. ŚB.), while the mantra *sūyavasād bhagavatī* .. (cf. AB.) is recited. The Hir. passage, which omits the clause *avartim evāsmin pāpmānam pratimuñcatīti vijñāyate* and combines the lowing of the cow with the milking of blood in one expiation (without the mantra *yasmād bhīṣāvāśiṣṭhās*, ĀpŚS. 9, 5, 11) seems to be later than Āp. Apparently AthPr. 2, 4 is based on AB., which seems also to have influenced, directly or by way of ĀśvŚS., the Mānavas (MŚS. 3, 2, 1: water is applied

to the udders and the mouth). Most interesting is VādhS. 3, 20 (*A.O.* 4, p. 22), which seems to betray influences of ŚB.: .. *tad vidyāc: chreyān bhaviṣyāmi* (= ŚB.), *yajño mopānaṃsīd, yajñakratūn me dhārayanty agnihotry upāvikṣad iti* (cf. ŚB. *tad vidyāc chremāṇam me mahimānam adhārayamāṇo pavikṣac* ..). One should read *adhārayanty* or rather *'dhārayanty* instead of Caland's *dhārayanty*.

58. Now they say: "If the agnihotra cow of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should sit down while being milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Some now cause her to stand up with a formula. One should know that, if any one's agnihotra cow sits down while being milked, she does so, because she has seen evil[1] for the sacrificer consisting of absence of livelihood.[2] They cause her to stand up (reciting the formula): "The divine Aditi has risen". The divine Aditi is this (earth). Thereby they cause this (earth) to rise for him. "She has put life into the lord of sacrifice". Thereby they put (long) life into him. "Giving Indra his share". Thereby they put power into him. "And to Mitra and Varuṇa". Mitra and Varuṇa indeed are out- and inbreathing.[3] Thereby they put out- and inbreathing into him. After the oblation has been offered they give her away to a brahmin whom they will not visit during a year arguing: "To him we transfer[4] the evil of absence of livelihood".

59. As to this now the Vājasaneya observed: "They lose[5] a cow only due to lack of faith. [6]For they smite him (?) with absence of livelihood.[6] He should proceed thus: He should take a stick and make her stand up by pricking with it. As it also happens in daily life[7] that one drives in a cart for making a journey and the mule breaks down,[8] or that an ox after being yoked (to the cart or to the plough) sits down,[9] and one attains the desired distance by urging that (animal) on by means of a stick or a goad, so one attains the desired world in heaven by urging her on by means of a stick or goad. He should keep her for himself. On himself he thereby bestows fortune."

NOTES

[1] Eggeling translates *ārtim .. pāpmānam* in the ŚB. version of this passage by "suffering and evil". See also Dumont, o.c., p. 245 "la misère, le malheur" (TB. 1, 4, 3, 3); *Śrautakośa* I, p. 154 "the evil distress" (BŚS. 14, 23 quoting TB.). Presumably *pāpmānam* should neither be interpreted as an adjective, nor as an independent noun in an asyndetic construction, but as an apposition. See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 424 a and JB. 1, 10 (section 9-10, n.9).

[2] *avṛtti pāpman* also occurs JB. 1, 54. The parallel texts have *ārti pāpman*

(ŚB.) or *avarti pāpman* (TB.; see also VādhS. 4, 60, *A.O.* 6, p. 171 f. *te 'vartiṃ pāpmānaṃ kṣudhaṃ brahmahatyāṃ pratyūhya ..*; Caland erroneously observes that the word *avarti* "bis jetzt nur aus der Ṛs. zu belegen ist"). Both are derived from *ṛ-* and not from *vṛt-*. They do not refer particularly to absence of livelihood (see the quoted VādhS. passage, where *kṣudh-* is mentioned as a separate evil). The JB. version *avṛtti-* may be a reinterpretation of *avarti-* (TB.) rather than of *ārti-*, but compare AthPr. 2, 4 and AB. 5, 27, 6, where the cow foreseeing hunger and thirst *(= avṛtti)* starts lowing. For *avṛtti* see further JB. 1, 252 *(na .. aśanāyati na pipāsati nāsya kā canāvṛttir bhavati)* and JB. 2, 6 (where Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 14, n. 33 seems to misunderstand *nāśanāyati na pipāsati nāsya kā canāvṛttir bhavati*, as appears from his remark: "*nāsya kā canāvṛttir bhavati* may be taken to refer to transmigration"; the correct analysis should be *avṛttir*; moreover transmigration scarcely plays a role in the older parts of this brāhmaṇa).

[3] Instead of *prāṇāpānau* ŚB. has *prāṇodānau*, which proves that *udāna* in the compound at least means "inbreathing" in ŚB. Otherwise Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 165 b. For *prāṇāpānau* see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 55, p. 261 ff.

[4] ŚB. *pratimuñcāma iti* more closely follows TB. *pratimuñcati* than JB. *niveśayāma iti*.

[5] For *apakram-* referring to the loss of something see e.g. ŚB. 4, 6, 9, 4 "that food .. does not go away from them" (Eggeling), where instead of "to go away" I would prefer "to become lost". It mostly refers to the loss of energy, royal power, vital airs, etc. ŚB. 13, 2, 6, 7 "neither fiery spirit, nor energy, nor cattle, nor prosperity pass away from him" (Eggeling), i.e. he does not lose cattle, energy etc. So *apakram-* in the present passage does not imply an intentional action of the cow, e.g. walking away, and Eggeling's translation "the cow turns from them as from faithless ones" should be rejected.

[6] On this (probably corrupt) clause see the introduction of this section.

[7] *adas* (Eggeling translates "here") denoting that which is not present may as an adverb refer to place or time. It indicates that something happens on another occasion rather than being "indice d'une antériorité proche ou lointaine" (Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 191 a). As such it is indifferent as to the time this occasion takes place. It is not only used "soit pour rappeler une procédure déjà vue (see e.g. JB. 1, 54; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8), soit pour évoquer la geste mythique dont la geste rituel est le reflet" (Minard, l.c.), but may also refer in a comparison (as here) to the non-ritual sphere, daily life, to be taken as the other occasion which may be situated in past, present or future. Primarily meaning "there" it does not only denote the other place or sphere, but also the "not-happening-here" and in that (to some extent) temporal sense ("on that other occasion, then") it may often refer to the past. For *adas* in comparisons as here see Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 16 and p. 63 and Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft*, p. 31, who translate "im gewöhnlichen Leben".

[8] For *gadāyate* the ŚB. version has (perhaps more correctly) *gadāyeta*. Thieme, *Pratidānam, Studies .. Kuiper* (The Hague 1968), p. 385 rightly criticizes Eggeling's rendering "might become weary". Since *gadāyate* literally means "to become ill", one may prefer his "zusammenbrechen". The collapse may be due to excessive speed, but other causes, e.g. the length of the journey, are conceivable. Therefore I do not agree with Thieme that *dhāvayataḥ* were to imply that one "mit höchster Eile seinen Weg zurücklegt" (moreover in the case of the ox the "Eile" would lie in the intention of the driver rather than be realized by the animal). Everywhere *dhāvayati* means

"to drive". The speed depends on the contexts. I hope to give a more detailed discussion of Thieme's interpretation of *dhāvayati* on another occasion.

[9] *upaviśati*, missing in ŚB., may have been inserted in JB. for the sake of a more exact comparison. On the other hand, however, *balīvardo vā yuktas* without *upaviśati* and therefore to be taken with *gadāyeta* stands in a rather strange position after the predicate in the ŚB. version. Should one connect *yuktas* with all three animals (as Eggeling and Thieme, *Pratidānam*, p. 385 do)? Perhaps *dhāvayataḥ* and *gadāyeta* have to be used only with the horse (missing in JB.) and the mule, which become exhausted by the long or swift journey and have to be beaten with a stick, whereas the ox sits down (*upaviś-*, dropped out in ŚB.) after being yoked to the cart (i.e. at the start of a journey as oxen may do even without being tired) and is raised by means of a goad. This interpretation accounts for the twofold urging forward *(daṇḍaprajitena tottraprajitena)*.

60. *The calf of the agnihotra cow is lost. The cow milks blood*

On the first paragraph see the introduction of Section 58-59. The expiation *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇo 'gnihotraṃ juhvato 'gnihotrīvatso naśyet* has no parallel in any text. In fact, though being introduced by the stock phrase *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇo ..*, it does not form an independent prāyaścitti. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11, its source, mentions the views of Āruṇi on the agnihotra in connection with the sitting down of the cow. The quotation of Āruṇi's interpretation of the agnihotra is not confined to the expiation under discussion. Āruṇi did not express his views with regard to one particular expiation. He is quoted by ŚB., because this text wants to demonstrate that the sitting down of the cow does not need an expiation. Āruṇi gives a cosmic interpretation of the rite (cf. JB. 1, 51 and ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 2 f.) in which the identification of heaven and cow, wind and calf, earth and *agnihotrasthālī*, implies that the cow and the calf cannot get lost *(kva hy asau|eṣa naśyet)*, the *agnihotrasthālī* cannot break *(kva hīyam bhidyeta)* and the sitting down of the cow brings down heaven and its fortune in the form of rain. JB. quotes a somewhat different version of Āruṇi's views (which deal with three subjects: the calf is lost; the milk is spilt; the cow sits down), but selects the first mentioned accident (the loss of the calf) as the central subject.

The JB. passage forms a rather careless adaptation and borrowing from the ŚB. version. The statement *no vā evaṃvido 'gnihotrī duhyamāno-paviśati* has to be taken as an automatic continuation of the argumentation *na .. agnihotrīvatso naśyati .. no .. agnihotraṃ duhyamānaṃ skandati* since the heaven-cow can sit down by pouring down rain. Introducing the (doubtful) expiation *yad .. agnihotrīvatso naśyet* with the formal question *kiṃ tatra karma kā prāyaścittiḥ* the JB. passage ends without describing a karman (there is in fact no karman since this expiation does not exist). Apparently the JB. redactor who borrowed from ŚB. was not a ritualist with interest in the practical aspects.

The second paragraph deals with the accident that the cow milks blood. This expiation does not occur in any other brāhmaṇa except ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 1), where it also comes after the sitting down (and lowing) of the cow, but introduces a new brāhmaṇa which deals with the falling of impurities into the milk. In its present form the expiation hardly seems to be the original. It is connected with the preceding expiations by the explanation of the accident (the cow foresees evil for the sacrificer). Perhaps originally the sitting down of the cow was the only token of distress (compare *sīdati* and its compounds meaning "to sit down", "to be distressed"). AB. 7, 3, 3 transfers this explanation to the lowing of the cow. Since milking blood is not a conscious action of the cow (such as sitting down or lowing) one may assume that it does not express the feelings of the cow on the sacrificer's future and that consequently the passage *tāṃ tasyām āhutyām brāhmaṇāya dadyād ... ārtim evāsmiṃs tat*

pāpmānam pratimuñcati seems to have been taken by the author of ŚB. from ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 9, where *mutatis mutandis* it forms the (rejected) view of *eke* (the Taitt.) on the sitting down of the cow. The JB. version here reads .. *pratidṛśya duhe yā lohitaṃ duhe* (= ŚB.), whereas 1, 58 the TB. turn of phrase (.. *pratidṛśyopaviśati yasyāgnihotrī duhyamāno-paviśati*) is followed.

Not only is the interpretation of the accident secondary, but the expiation itself also seems to show traces of an incoherent treatment. It may be useful first to establish the meaning of this blood in the milk. Evidently this expiation has no relation to the sitting down of the cow (only the fact that the cow has to be given away may have formed a link), but should be regarded as a defilement of the milk. Therefore it introduces in ŚB. a new brāhmaṇa on the falling of impurities into the milk. As blood in the milk is not an ordinary impurity (it also concerns the cow), special measures have to be taken. The milk is cooked on the *anvāhāryapacana* (= dakṣiṇāgni), which is surrounded. This implies that this milk is dangerous and that it is destined for demons or evil powers. On the use of the dakṣiṇāgni for offerings to evil spirits see Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, p. 288; for the removal of hostile influences by means of mats etc. see o.c., p. 383 (here the sacrificial fire is not surrounded in order to keep off the demons from the oblation, but in order to keep the evil influence within the surrounded place). The evil spirits are allowed to have offerings of blood (Keith, o.c., p. 241). While performing these sacrifices one should inaudibly mention the names of these spirits (AB. 2, 7; compare ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *tūṣṇīm .. aniruktam*, where a different explanation is given). KŚS. 25, 2, 2 does not state that one should offer *tūṣṇīm*, but refers to Rudra (*rudrāya hutvā*; cf. BhārŚS. 9, 8, 7 *agnaye rudravate svāhā iti juhuyāt*). Rudra is the god who together with his hosts attacks the cattle. The blood in the milk is the manifestation of a disease caused by Rudra, whose anger is appeased by this offering. Blood is, on the other hand, one of the offerings made to Rudra's hosts. See Keith, o.c., p. 145: "The bloody entrails of the victim are made over to his (sc. Rudra's) hosts, which attack men and beast with disease and death, in order to avert their anger".

One may doubt whether *vyutkrāmatety uktvā* should mean that the sacrificer and others are addressed, as the commentary on ĀpŚS. 9, 5, 5, the *Śrautakośa* (I, p. 156) and, perhaps, also Caland (translating ĀpŚS. l.c. "schreitet hinaus") take it. The same imperative is found ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 13, where at the end of the animal sacrifice the priest carries round the Vasatīvarī water (which according to ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 16 is used for protection and for repelling the evil spirits) and says (thrice) *vyutkrāmata* "disperse" (Eggeling). Apparently the evil spirits are addressed. It is highly doubtful whether *vyutkram-* ever means "hinausschreiten". The verb either denotes the going apart of things or persons originally belonging together (cf. MS. 4, 1, 10: 14. 4 f. *prthivyā vai medhyaṃ cāmedhyaṃ ca vyudakrāmat prācīnam medhyam udakrāmat* .. etc.) or the dispersing in all directions. The later meaning especially applies to demons, as may appear from VādhS. 4, 8 (*A.O.* 6, p. 105 f.) *te 'nyajanā abruvann: asmān (api paśau*

anvābhajatam iti; tān ū)vadhyena (ca lohitena) ca nirabhājayatāṃ; tasmāt paśāv ūvadhyaṃ ca lohitaṃ ca na kurvanti; sa yaṃ dviṣyāt tam ūvadhyena ca lohitena (ca) manasā samajyāthainam etebhyo 'nyajanebhyaḥ saṃprayacchet, tasya prāṇair vyutkrāmanti.

In the expiation of ŚB. and JB. Rudra and his hosts are not mentioned. Moreover the injunction *vyutkrāmata* is hardly correct before the cooking of the milk if our interpretation is right. That the offering is made *tūṣṇīm* (i.e. without mentioning the name of the gods or powers to whom the oblation is dedicated) is easily understood in the case of Rudras, Rakṣasas etc. (cf. AB. 2, 7). The explanation of *tūṣṇīm* in ŚB., however, is not convincing in the context and may have been taken from ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7. It may be concluded that this expiation, though first occurring in ŚB., did not originate with this brāhmaṇa (or JB.). For this expiation see further KŚS. 25, 2, 2 and the younger Taitt., of which BhārŚS. (9, 8, 7) has an offering with *agnaye rudravate svāhā*, whereas the later Āp. (9, 5, 5) and Hir. (15, 2, 4) sūtras agree more with ŚB. (and with JB.; the offering is made silently or with the three vyāhṛtis). See also ĀśvŚS. 3, 11 (offering on the gārhapatya).

60. Now they say: "If the calf of the agnihotra cow of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should get lost,[1] what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" As to this now Āruṇi observed: "The agnihotra cow is heaven, her calf is the sun,[2] the agnihotra pot is this (earth).[3] Surely the calf of the agnihotra cow of him who knows thus does not get lost, for where should it (the sun) get lost? Neither does the agnihotra milk of him who knows thus be spilt during milking, for it remains lying on this earth (= the agnihotra pot). Nor does the agnihotra cow of him who knows thus lie down while being milked. When that (heaven) heavily rains, they say of it: Oh, it has rained so much that it seemed to sit (or: to come) down on (the earth)".[4]

Now they further say: "If she should milk blood, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" If now she milks blood, she milks it, because she has seen evil for the sacrificer consisting of absence of livelihood. He should say: "Disperse" and order the anvāhāryapacana fire to be screened. Having put that (bloody) milk on it and having made a stirring spoon he should boil it. On the spot[5] (i.e. in the anvāhāryapacana) he should pour it[5] out silently. Prajāpati, one should know, is undefined[6] and the agnihotra is sacred to Prajāpati. And also with these utterances *"bhūr, bhuvas, svar"*. Now these utterances are expiations for all. So he makes expiation with this All.[7]

NOTES

[1] I take *naśyati* as "to get lost" instead of "to perish" (Eggeling). Cf. AB. 7, 9, 2 ff. *yadi kapālaṃ .. yadi pavitraṃ .. yadi hiraṇyaṃ naśyet* "If a potsherd .. the filter .. the gold be lost" (Keith). In this interpretation *kva* can have its usual meaning "where" (Eggeling: "how").

[2] Just as the calf makes the milk flow, so the sun (JB.) or the wind (ŚB.) brings about rain. For the connection between sun and rain see Lüders, *Varuṇa*, p. 308 ff.

[3] For the identification of the earth and the agnihotrasthālī *(iyam evāgnihotrasthālī)* and its consequences *(no vā evaṃvido 'gnihotraṃ duhyamānaṃ skandaty asyāṃ hy eva pratitiṣṭhati;* not found in the ŚB. parallel) one may perhaps compare KS. 6, 3: 51. 18 ff. *yā sthāly agnihotratapanī tayā duhyād iyaṃ vai sā na vā* (emendation Caland, *Festschrift Ernst Kuhn*, p. 69) *imām iha nehātiskandaty anayaivopasīdati tad asyāskannaṃ bhavati* and MS. 1, 8, 3: 118. 1 f. *sthālyā duhaty anayā vā etad upasīdanti nahīmam ito netaḥ skandaty askannatvāya.*

[4] Oertel: *yathā vā eṣa suvṛṣṭaṃ varṣaty abhiniṣady eva tathāvarṣīd ity enām āhuḥ.* Crit. ed: *yadā vā eṣā suspṛṣṭaṃ varṣaty abhiniṣady eva batāvarṣīd ity enām āhuḥ.* Here the ŚB. version is completely different. For the undoubtedly correct reading *suvṛṣṭaṃ* compare TS. 1, 6, 10, 5 *yathā vai parjanyaḥ suvṛṣṭaṃ varṣaty evaṃ yajño yajamānāya varṣati;* TB. 3, 11, 10, 3 *yathā vai parjanyaḥ suvṛṣṭaṃ vṛṣṭvā ..* See also Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* II, 2, p. 580. The quoted parallels seem to support Oertel's conjecture *yathā*. If one assumes a comparison, *evam* (for *eva*) may be preferred to *tathā* (see TS. 1, 6, 10, 5). The interjection *bata* (thus most mss. read) and the use of the aorist, however, seem to be contrary to such an interpretation. Therefore *yadā* (and *bata*) should be retained. In a heavy rainfall heaven (*eṣā* refers to a fem. *dyauḥ*) seems to be coming down on earth *(abhiniṣadī)*; at least the downpour may have been described so in the colloquial (note the interjection *bata*) speech. One may also read *abhiniṣadyeva*. See M.-W. s.v. *bata*: ".. originally placed after the leading word at the beginning of a sentence, or only separated from it by *iva*". In the context *iva* "so to say" is quite suitable after the rather strong expression *abhiniṣadya*.

[5] *tad tad eva* (crit. ed.: *evaṃ sarveṣu kośeṣu*) is obviously correct (Oertel: *tad eva*) since the first *tad* refers to the milk (cf. *tad adhiśritya .. śrapayet*) and the second is an adverb (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad evopaviśet;* 12, 4, 2, 5 *tad evainad abhiparyādhāya viṣyandayet*).

[6] Before this clause *aniruktam* must have dropped out or been omitted by the compiler of JB., as appears from the ŚB. version. On *anirukta-*, silence and Prajāpati see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 26, n. 12 (on JB. 2, 12). See also Renou & Silburn, *Sarup Comm. Volume* (1954), p. 68-79 and Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* II (Paris 1960), p. 57.

[7] Here the ŚB. version is different: *sarvaṃ vā aniruktaṃ tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittiṃ kurute.* Perhaps JB. has replaced this passage by *atho bhūr bhuvas svar iti* .. etc. taken from 1, 53 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 8), where similarly *tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittiṃ kurute* is found. Why should one pour out *tūṣṇīm* as well as *(atho)* with the three vyāhṛtis? Or should *atho* be taken as "but also (according to others)", i.e. as *athavā* (cf. ĀpŚS. 9, 5, 5)?

61. *The extinction of the fires*

This section dealing with the extinction of the āhavanīya or the gārhapatya starts a series of expiations (1, 61-65) which refer to the fires, their extinction, fusion, being taken out too late. Apparently JB. regards these five chapters as a unity since 1, 62; 63 and 64 are introduced at the end of the preceding chapter by *atho khalv āhuḥ*. The independent, new expiation of the extinction of the fires is, remarkably enough, also announced at the end of JB. 1, 60 (in Oertel's edition, however, *atho khalv āhuḥ* is missing) and not introduced by *tad āhur yad etasya dīrgha-sattriṇaḥ* .. There is, however, no relation between the chapters 60 and 61.

The beginning of this section seems to be corrupt. It starts with *yad agnayo 'nugaccheyuḥ kiṃ tatra karma kā prāyaścittir iti* and continues without specifying a fire *tam u haika ulmukād eva nirmanthanti*. From the parallel ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3 appears that the gārhapatya is meant. There is obviously an omission (see also Oertel, o.c., p. 342, n. 1). JB. 1, 61 started with *yad agnayo 'nugaccheyuḥ* by way of introduction to this section which deals with the extinction of the (two) fires in several situations. The specification of the first expiation, the extinction of the gārhapatya, was left out (perhaps on account of the fact that the extinction of the gārhapatya again occurs in the third paragraph).

The order of the expiations dealing with the extinction of the fires is different in ŚB. This text starts a new brāhmaṇa with the extinction of the fire (i.e. the āhavanīya) after the first oblation has been offered; an expiation which, coming after *srucy unnītam amedhyam āpadyeta | avavarṣet* (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9-10), suits the chronological arrangement of the ŚB. prāyaścittis. JB., in spite of its systematical arrangement, deals with this expiation at the end of 1, 56 (after the falling of rain on the milk). The next paragraph in ŚB. (12, 4, 3, 2) again concerns the extinction of the āhavanīya; in this case before the oblation has been offered *(purāgnihotrād)*. Here the strictly chronological order is no longer observed by ŚB., which continues with the extinction of the gārhapatya (12, 4, 3, 3), an accident taking place either before the rite has started with the transference of fire to the āhavanīya or after the conclusion of the sacrifice, when the āhavanīya has already gone out. For JB., which had transferred the extinction of the āhavanīya *pūrvasyām āhutau hutāyām* to 1, 56, there was no reason to deal first with the extinction of the āhavanīya *purāgnihotrād* (as was done in ŚB., where the two expiations concerning the āhavanīya are placed together). Consequently it starts with the gārhapatya and thereafter deals with the āhavanīya (which is taken out of the gārhapatya). The rest of this chapter runs parallel to ŚB. (12, 4, 3, 6-10; 12, 4, 4, 1) with this difference that the JB. version of ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4-5 has been transferred to the expiations for the fusion of the fires (JB. 1, 65).

First the text mentions the expiation of *eke* who again churn out the

gārhapatya from a charred *ulmuka* (firebrand). This may refer to MS. 1, 8, 9: 130. 1 f. *yasyāgnir anugacchet tebhya evāvakṣāṇebhyo 'dhi manthitavyas tad enaṃ svād yoneḥ prajanayati.* The *Śrautakośa (Sanskrit Section)* I, p. 95 f. is wrong in connecting ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3, in the section *ahute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet* with MS. 1, 8, 8 and KS. 6, 6 (without mentioning JB. 1, 61, the closest parallel) and MS. 1, 8, 9: 130. 1 ff. with several passages which deal with the extinction of the āhavanīya. ŚB. and JB., rejecting this expiation, argue that in order to procure fire from this firebrand one has two possibilities. Either one takes the firebrand away from the gārhapatya (an apparently inadmissible action because it brings about the loss of something belonging to that fire) or one cuts off a piece from it. This would imply that the firebrand is preserved, but at the cost of the equally dangerous cutting, which makes an incision and endangers the wholeness and continuity of the rite. The difference between the expiation found in JB. and ŚB. (the fire is churned in the firedrill out of charcoal scraped from a charred firebrand) and the one rejected is that there is nothing taken away or cut off. The charcoal is scraped from the firebrand (ŚB. reads *ulmukād aṅgāram ādāya*; JB. *ulmukād apacchidya* seems to be less original since it does not clearly avoid the idea of cutting) and completely merges in the newly produced fire during the churning. Producing the fire from a firebrand or from a part of it would imply that this wood is left after the fire has been churned out, i.e. that something has been taken away which keeps existing outside the fire.

Most texts agree that the āhavanīya, if it goes out, may again be taken out (cf., however, TS. 2, 2, 4, 7) and that the gārhapatya may again be churned out, provided that the āhavanīya has not yet been taken out. If the āhavanīya is (still) burning, several expiations are prescribed, most of which are discussed and criticized in the comparatively late brāhmaṇas ŚB. and JB. Remarkably enough AB. 7, 5, 8 mentions and rejects the same four expiations as ŚB. (and JB.) and discusses them in the same order. ŚB. and AB., however, do not criticize each other's expiation. TB. 1, 4, 4, 7 disapproves of three prāyaścittis proposed in connection with the extinction of the gārhapatya, but its own expiation *(āhavanīyam udvāpya gārhapatyaṃ manthet)* is rejected by AB. as well as ŚB.

The following expiations are discussed by ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 6 ff. and JB.: a) From the āhavanīya (forming the new gārhapatya) a new āhavanīya is taken out: MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 4 and (in case of haste) KS. 6, 6: 55. 8. This is rejected by KS. itself and by TB. *(vāstavyam agniṃ upāsīta, rudro 'sya paśūn ghātukaḥ syāt)*; AB. *(prāyatanāc cyaveta)*; ŚB./JB. The JB. version omits the argumentation of the *eke (prāṇā vā agnayaḥ .. iti vadantaḥ)* and thereby obscures its objection against this expiation. JB. has rather carelessly borrowed from ŚB., but not only from that text. The argument of AB. *(prāyatanāc cyaveta)* has been applied by JB. to the next expiation *(pra nvā ayam asyai pratiṣṭhāyā acyoṣṭa;* compare in a different context VādhS. 4, 16, *A.O.* 6, p. 113: *prāyatanād acyoṣṭā-pratiṣṭhito bhaviṣyati).* b) From the āhavanīya fire is taken back to the

gārhapatya. AB. *(asuravad yajñaṃ tanvīta)* and ŚB./JB. disapprove of this expiation (without source). The argumentation of ŚB. seems to have been taken from ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 7 *(svargyaṃ vā etad yad agnihotram ..)*, where it is more suitable since it refers to the oblation. JB. wrongly connects the argumentation of AB. from the preceding expiation with this prāyaścitti, in which the gārhapatya is not left at all. c) The gārhapatya is again churned out. TB. *(vicchindyāt. bhrātṛvyam asmai janayet)*; AB. *(bhrātṛvyaṃ yajamānasya janayet)* and ŚB./JB. criticize this unknown source. d) The āhavanīya is extinguished and the gārhapatya churned out anew: KS. 6, 6: 55. 7 and TB. 1, 4, 4, 7. This expiation is rejected by AB. *(yad anugamayet prāṇo yajamānaṃ jahyāt)* and ŚB./JB. e) One moves to another place, churns out the fire there and returns the next day: KS. 6, 6: 55. 9 ff. *anyatraivāvasāyāgniṃ mathitvoddhṛtya juhuyāt saiva tatra prāyaścittis tataś śvo 'gnaye tapasvate ...* This is followed by ŚB./JB. The own expiation of AB. *(sarvam evainaṃ sahabhasmānaṃ samopya gārhapatyāyatane nidhāyātha prāñcam āhavanīyam uddharet;* cf. GB. 1, 3, 13 *sabhasmakam āhavanīyam .. gārhapatyāyatane pratiṣṭhāpya tata āhavanīyaṃ praṇīya ..)*, remarkably enough, is not commented upon by ŚB. On the other hand AB. (as well as TB.) is silent on the expiation of KS., which is adopted by ŚB./JB. So the relation between the texts dealing with these expiations is not perfectly clear, but one may assume that the chronological order is: KS. (MS.) — TB. — AB. — ŚB. — JB. Apparently the treatment of this expiation in MS. is corrupt. The extinction of the gārhapatya and the āhavanīya seem to have been confused. In case the gārhapatya goes out (after the *uddharaṇa* of the āhavanīya), an expiation is prescribed which is even criticized by KS. The expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya has been extended with a passage which seems to refer to the gārhapatya. The mantra *ita eva prathamaṃ jajñe ..* (MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 10 f.) is hardly suitable after the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya, but refers to new churning out of the gārhapatya from the remains of the old fire (see TB. 1, 4, 4, 8). The formula *iṣe rāye ramasva* is found in the same context in TB., but is connected with the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya in MS.

Among the sūtras BŚS. 14, 24 (Śālīki's view) follows TB., whereas 23, 8 (Baudhāyana's view) agrees with AB. The younger Taitt. have taken this expiation partly from KS. and MS. (see Caland's translation of ĀpŚS. 9, 1, 1 ff.). BhārŚS. 9, 12, 10 — 9, 13, 2 almost completely agrees with MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 9 ff. *athābhimantrayeta ita eva prathamaṃ jajñe .. aṣṭākapālaṃ nirvaped vāruṇaṃ yavamayaṃ cārum).* The difference, however, is that the passage in MS. is introduced by *yasyāhute 'gnihotre pūrvo 'gnir anugacched* and followed by *yasyāhute 'gnihotre pūrvo 'gnir anugacchet,* The sūtra passage begins with *yadi sāyam ahute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet pūrvam agnim anvavasāya tata eva prāñcam uddhṛtya juhuyāt* (BhārŚS. 9, 12, 9; cf. MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 3 ff. *yasyāhute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet tata eva prāñcam uddhṛtyānvavasāyāgnihotraṃ juhuyād athābhimantrayeta ..*). It is evident that the MS. passage is corrupt and that after *athābhimantrayeta* in the expiation for the ex-

tinction of the gārhapatya (MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 4 f.) should come the mantra *ita eva prathamaṃ jajñe* .. etc. in accordance with BhārŚS. This mantra, quoted by BhārŚS. 9, 11, 7 as *itaḥ prathamaṃ jajñe* (instead of *ita eva* ..), occurs TS. 2, 2, 4, 7 (likewise reading *itaḥ prathamam*) in connection with the churning of a new fire in case the āhavanīya has gone out. However, there seems to be no relation with the corrupt passage in MS. (TS. rejects the expiation of MS. and KS. which prescribe that the āhavanīya should be taken out anew). MŚS. 3, 3, 1 follows the MS. text as transmitted to us (miss van Gelder's rendering of *yasyāhute 'gnihotre* "after the agnihotra oblation" has to be corrected into "before the oblation has been offered"), but for the extinction of the gārhapatya it adopts the expiation of KS. (MŚS. 3, 3, 2). Notice that *sāyaṃprātar juhuyāc chvo bhūte* .. etc. confirms our interpretation of *ubhayatorātram/abhitorātram* (JB./ŚB.) in n. 18. ĀśvŚS. 3, 12 f. and KŚS. 25, 3, 4 ff. do not follow their own brāhmaṇa. Caland, ĀpŚS. 9, 9, 1, n. 1 seems to suggest that ĀśvŚS. may have borrowed from ĀpŚS.: "Vor den Spruch des TBr. *iṣe rayyai* fügt Āp. die Worte *agne samrāḍ* ein, so hat auch (nach ihm?) Āśv.". Since Bhār. does not have this insertion and Āp. must have taken these words from another text, the reverse may be equally possible. AthPr. 1, 5 (extinction of the gārhapatya) has been borrowed from AB.; AthPr. 5, 1 (corrupt) follows several schools of YV. The extinction of the āhavanīya, which has been omitted by TB. and for which the younger Taitt. have taken their expiation from KS., is treated by BŚS. 13, 7 in accordance with the expiation of TS. 2, 2, 3, 7 f. BŚS. 27, 11 accepts the expiation which had been rejected by TS.

61. "If the fires should go out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some churn it out from a firebrand, arguing: "Wherefrom in the last resort it gets lost to man, that is the point whence he strives after its expiation".[1] But he should not consider it thus. For[2] (in that case) he should go and take away a firebrand from that (fire) or cut off something from a firebrand.[3] He should proceed in this way. Having planed[4] something from a firebrand he should tear it up[5] on the fire-stick (i.e. in the hole of the lower *araṇi*). Surely[6] he reaches the object in view of which one churns (the fire) from a firebrand[7] as well as that in view of which (one churns it) in the fire-stick.

Now they further say: "If the āhavanīya after being taken out (from the gārhapatya) should be extinguished, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" There is, forsooth, no real extinction of that fire,[8] as long as the gārhapatya does not go out. Even if it should go out many[9] times, he should again and again take it out. That is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If the gārhapatya should become extinct

after the āhavanīya has been taken out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some take it (i.e. the new fire) out from that same (āhavanīya) forward. But he should not do it thus. If some one[10] were to say in that case "Surely this one has expelled the sacrificer's lifebreaths forward.[11] This sacrificer will die", it would come to pass so.

Now some take it (i.e. the new gārhapatya) back from that same (āhavanīya), arguing: "The gārhapatya is the (forward) exhalation, the āhavanīya the (backward) inhalation. These two in their interactive association of ex- and inhalation[12] eat food".[13] But on the other hand the gārhapatya is also the house and the house is the point of support. If some one were to say of him in that case "This one has fallen from his point of support. This sacrificer will die", it would come to pass so.

Now some having churned it[14] (i.e. the new gārhapatya) on the (old) gārhapatya lay (a firewood from the new gārhapatya) on (the old āhavanīya which is still burning). But he should not do it thus. If some one were to say in that case "He has produced a (new) fire over[15] a (still existing) fire. Soon a hostile rival will be produced for him", it would come to pass so.

Now some churn it out (anew) after having extinguished (the āhavanīya). But he should not do it thus. If some one were to say in that case[16] "He has even caused to expire what was left him. No heir will remain to him", it would come to pass so.

He should proceed in this way: He should lift (the fires) on the two fire-sticks (with the formulas:) "This is thy proper womb, whence born thou didst shine. Knowing it, O Agni, mount it and increase our wealth" or[17] "and promote our songs of praise". Having broken up his place of sacrifice and moved to another place he should stay there a night and offer. In this new place there is offered by him before and after the night[18] and he does not incur any disapprobation.[19]

At daybreak having taken out the ashes and smeared (the fireplaces) around with a lump of cow-dung he should set up his fires in the usual way. This is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If on his āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out —

NOTES

[1] Eggeling translates the ŚB. parallel (12, 4, 3, 3) *yato vai puruṣasyāntato naśyati tato vai sa tasya prāyaścittim icchate* "Whereby man's (body) is

destroyed in the end, it is therefrom he desires the expiation of this (mishap)". The ellipse of "body" is harsh (are there any parallels for such an ellipse?) and the motivation of the expiation hardly makes sense. The reason why one churns out fire from the firebrand *(ulmuka)* is that one tries to preserve the continuity of the sacrifice. One expiates from the very point where the accident has taken place (compare the expiation of JB. 1, 54, where milk is ladled out on the spot where milk has been spilt). The *ulmuka* mentioned here is a partly charred firebrand from the extinguished gārhapatya. It is the vanishing-point of the fire. From the point where the fire escapes man (*puruṣasya;* JB. *mānuṣyasya;* a *gen. pro dat.*) ultimately, in the last resort *(antataḥ)*, therefrom he wishes to make an expiation. One may also assume a more general utterance: "Wherefrom man loses something from that point he starts his expiation".

[2] After the rejection *(tad u tathā na kuryāt)* of the expiation of *eke* the text continues according to Eggeling's translation of ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3 with the own view of the brāhmaṇa: *ulmukaṃ ha vai vādāya careyur ulmukasya vāvavraścam itthaṃ eva kuryād ulmukād aṅgāram ādāya tam araṇyor abhivimathnīyād* "but let them proceed by taking either a firebrand or a piece from a firebrand; — let him do it in this way: — having taken a coal from a firebrand, let him crumble it on the two churning-sticks". The ample use of punctuation marks looks suspicious. Moreover the alternation of plural *(eke .. manthanti)*, singular *(na kuryāt)*, plural *(careyur)* and singular *(itthaṃ eva kuryāt)* indicates that *careyur* does not refer to the own ŚB. view. The stock pattern of discussions with other schools in these prāyaścittis is the following: a) First comes the view of the others (ŚB. *tad dhaike, taṃ/tāṃ haike;* JB. *tad/tam/tām u haike ..*). b) This is followed by the rejection of this view *(tad u tathā na kuryāt)*. In JB. the stock phrase sometimes is *tad u tathā na vidyāt* if referring to a theory *(manyante* or *iti vadantaḥ)* rather than to a practice. ŚB. once has *tan nādriyeta* in a reaction on the criticism of others *(tad dhaika upavalhante)*, where JB. again has *tad u tathā na vidyāt.* c) Then comes the argumentation of the rejection *(yo ha tatra brūyāt ..; yo hainaṃ tatra brūyāt ..)*. The stereotyped turn of phrase is not always used in this argumentation; see e.g. JB. 1, 55; 57. d) Only then comes the brāhmaṇa's own prescript (almost invariably introduced by *itthaṃ eva kuryāt*). We must conclude that *ulmukaṃ ha vai vādāya careyur ulmukasya vāvavraścam* (standing between *tad u tathā na kuryāt* and *itthaṃ eva kuryāt*) forms the argumentation of the rejection. This is also confirmed by JB. *(ulmukaṃ hy eva tata ādāya cared ulmukasya vāvavraścam)*, which has replaced the less distinctly explicative particle *vai* by *hi* (and the plural by the equally correct singular caret: "he would ..", sc. "if he would act like the *eke*"). For the use of *vai* in these argumentations see ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad u tan nādriyeta. yadā vā etad ..* (cf. JB. 1, 54); JB. 1, 57 *tad u tathā na vidyān na vai pretasya ..* Simply translating *vai* by "for" would, however, be incorrect (see Caland, *A.O.* 2, p. 28). The connotation seems to be "now (one should know that)". [After having sent the manuscript to the press I now discover that Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 132-138 deals with the scheme of the "dialectique du blâme". My treatment of this subject which refers to a special sub-type of discussions may amplify Minard's well-founded conclusions, which are especially important with regard to the function of *eva* (marking the "réaffirmation de la doctrine correcte" as in the present passage)]

[3] *avavraścam* is not a noun (Eggeling: "piece"; cf. also Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik*; Index Hauschild, s.v.), but a gerund in *-am*

(cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 3 *saṃvraścam*), here construed with a partitive genitive *(ulmukasya)*. For *carati* with a gerund *(ādāya)* see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 408, for *carati* with *avavraścam* see o.c., p. 404. See also Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, p. 60 ff. on these constructions.

[4] Instead of *ulmukād evāpacchidya* the ŚB. version has *ulmukād aṅgāram ādāya*, which proves that *apacchid-* denotes the planing or scratching of (a very thin chip of) charcoal from the firewood.

[5] JB. reads *abhivimanthet*, ŚB. *abhivimathnīyāt*. Miss Narten, "Das vedische Verbum math", *I.I.J.* 4, pp. 121-135 has proved that we should assume two formally as well as semasiologically different verbs: *manth-* "to churn" and *math-* "to snatch, rob". The compounded verb *vi-math-* (occurring only in the plural) means "auseinanderreissen, auseinanderreissend rauben"; *abhivimath-* is only found in the present ŚB. passage (12, 4, 3, 3), where Miss Narten translates *ulmukād aṅgāram ādāya tam araṇyor abhivimathnīyāt* "man soll aus einem Feuerbrand eine Kohle nehmen und diese auf die zwei Reibhölzer hin auseinanderreissen" (o.c., p. 130). Apparently JB. in borrowing this passage from ŚB. has replaced the verb *abhivimath-* by *abhivimanth-* (*vimanth-* does not occur in Vedic texts; all compounded forms with *vi-* are from *math-*). The charcoal is not crumbled by the upper churning stick, but it is torn up on the fire-drill by the hands of the priest before the churning of the fire.

[6] Read with all mss. *upāha tam* instead of *upa ha tam*. See Hoffmann, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 7 referring to Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 520 for the use of this particle *aha*.

[7] Since there does not seem to be any parallel for a noun *mathyā* and an ellipse of a feminine noun is excluded, one should perhaps emend with Oertel (and the ŚB. version) to *ulmukamathya* (sc. *agnau*).

[8] The transmitted text cannot be correct. Either *bhavati* should be emended to *bhavatu* or *anugato* to *ananugato*. ("Let it be extinguished, (there is no problem) as long as the gārhapatya does not go out"; "It is not (really) extinguished, as long as the gārhapatya does not go out").

[9] JB. replaces *śatam eva kṛtvaḥ* (ŚB.) by *bahv iva kṛtvaḥ*. On *iva* = *eva* see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 307. This equation is rejected by D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva .. (thesis Marburg 1970), whose remark "Anstelle des schwierigen *iva* konnte nur zu leicht das — vermeintlich — bequemere *evá* treten" does not apply here, since JB. *(iva)* borrows from ŚB. *(eva)*.

[10] Oertel and Raghu Vira have adopted the *lectio difficilior yo 'ṅga* instead of *yo ha* (the reading of some mss. and the parallel clauses). As *yo 'ṅga* is a frequent combination in the saṃhitās, but has a rather different meaning here ("just he who; only he who"), and as this combination is not found in Vedic prose, one should retain the *lectio facilior yo ha* and take *yo 'ṅga* as a corruption.

[11] *prāco nvā ayaṃ yajamānasya prāṇān prārautsīt* (JB. *prāvṛkṣat*) "Surely, this one has obstructed the forward vital airs" (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "? Or, has forced them forward"). E.'s latter interpretation should be adopted, since it agrees more with the actual performance of the expiation. The fires are the sacrificer's breaths (see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III), the *vihāra* in which they are arranged is his body. By moving these fires/breaths forward the āhavanīya is excluded from the old *vihāra*/body in a forward direction, i.e. one drives the *prāṇāḥ* out of the sacrificer and kills him. For the difficult *pravṛj-* see also Section 45-46, n. 15. The preverb *pra-* not only implies "forward", but also "outward" (cf. *prāṇa-* "out-breathing"). So

pravṛj- perhaps means "to keep out of someone or something; to exclude something; to exclude someone from something".

[12] Corresponding to JB. *prāṇāpānau* ŚB. has *prāṇodānau* (see also Section 58-59, n. 3). Here the gārhapatya is equated with *prāṇa*, because this fire is taken out forward *(pra-)* to the āhavanīya. The latter fire being identical with the inbreathing or backward breathing *(apāna/udāna)* is therefore allowed to be taken out back to the gārhapatya.

[13] Oertel's conjecture *atteti* was rightly rejected by Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64. The two fires in their association *(saṃvidānau)* as expiration and inhalation "eat food", i.e. they form a (breathing) living being (presumably the sacrificer), which remains alive and prospers through this co-operation, this breathing out and in, this moving forward and backward of the fires. The expression "to eat food" only means "to remain alive" (see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 403 a).

[14] For *evam avadhitvopasamādadhati* (thus the crit. ed. without any v.l.), which was also conjectured by Oertel (mss. A, B *adhitvo*, C *apadhitvo*), read with Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64 *eva mathihopa°*, apparently a misprint for *mathitvopa°*. The new gārhapatya (as in the preceding expiations expressed by *tam*) is churned out on the old gārhapatya fireplace *(gārhapatye)* and a firewood from the new gārhapatya is put on the still burning āhavanīya *(upasamādadhati)* by way of renewed *uddharaṇa*. Note the ellipsis of the object.

[15] JB. *agnāv adhy agnim ajījanat kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātṛvyo janiṣyate;* ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 8 *agner nvā ayam adhi dviṣantam bhrātṛvyam ajījanata kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātṛvyo janiṣyate* "Surely, this one has raised a spiteful enemy from out of the fire .." (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "Viz. inasmuch as he takes out a new Āhavanīya from the newly kindled Gārhapatya, and puts it on the still burning Āhavanīya fire"). Eggeling's interpretation of the abl. *agneḥ*, however, remains obscure, the more so as *ajījanata* obviously refers to the churning out of the new gārhapatya. Moreover the JB. version does not support Eggeling's translation. Because JB. reads *tam .. gārhapatya eva mathitvā* and *agnāv adhy agnim ajījanat* one might assume that the old and the new gārhapatya should be *bhrātṛvya*, but the parallel TB. 1, 4, 4, 7 *(yad āhavanīyam anudvāpya gārhapatyaṃ manthet, vicchindyāt, bhrātṛvyam asmai janayet)* proves that the āhavanīya and the new gārhapatya are the rivals. This rivalry does not only arise through the putting of new fire on the āhavanīya (as Eggeling assumes), but already through the production as such *(ajījanata)* of the new fire while the old is still present. The āhavanīya is with respect to its fire identical to the extinguished gārhapatya. Therefore *adhi* with the loc. (JB.) or the abl. (ŚB.) should be interpreted as "over, on, above, in addition to". The ŚB. version then runs: "On an (existing) fire he has produced a rivalling (fire)".

[16] The usual ŚB. equivalent *yo hainaṃ tatra brūyāt* is missing in the transmitted ŚB. text (as was also observed by Eggeling), which shows that even the ŚB. text is not entirely trustworthy and that in incidental, less verifiable cases where the JB. version is superior, the ŚB. text may be simply corrupt.

[17] Instead of *iti vāsa udavasāya ..* (thus Oertel and the crit. ed.) read with Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64 *iti vā. sa udavasāya ..*: "Aus *vā* geht hervor, dass der letzte Pada des Spruches nach der Überlieferung des Ṛk- [i.e. *athā no vardhayā giraḥ*. ṚV. 3, 29, 10] oder des Yajurveda [i.e. *athā no vardhayā rayim*, VS. 3, 14; TS. 1, 5, 5, 2 and other texts] sein kann".

[18] Instead of *ubhayatorātram* ŚB. reads *abhitorātram*, which Eggeling translates by "towards night". See also M.-W., s.v. *abhitorātram*: "near (i.e.

either just at the beginning or end of) the night". As appears from the JB. version *abhitorātram* means "on both sides of the night, i.e. before and after the night". The agnihotra, though being performed every morning and evening, is regarded as consisting of two parts, the evening and the morning agnihotra, which belong together.

[19] Eggeling translates *na kāṃ cana paricakṣāṃ karoti* (ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 10) "he passes no censure on anyone", which does not make sense. The middle form *kurute* in JB. proves that the censure concerns oneself. The active in the ŚB. version may be rendered by "he does not give rise to criticism".

62–63. *The sun sets or rises over the āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out*

For these two expiations see especially ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6-7. Note the peculiar division of the chapters in JB. By starting 62 and 63 in the midst of a clause *(abhy astam iyāt; abhyudiyāt)* the brāhmaṇa shows that these two chapters closely belong together. The versions of JB. and ŚB. more or less agree. JB. 1, 63, however, contains a sentence which seems to be inexplicable in the context (see n. 7) and the end of 1, 63 (from *atha haika āhur* ..) also has no parallel in the ŚB. version and has no relation at all with the prāyaścittis, but refers to the frequently occurring discussion on the proper time for the performance of the agnihotra. The expiations only deal with the incidental and accidental taking out of the fire after the time prescribed by the relevant schools. The view quoted by JB. refers to the intentional offering after sunrise.

Other parallels of these expiations are MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 18 ff.; AB. 7, 12, 1 ff. and TB. 1, 4, 4, 1 ff. The oldest text (MS.) does not mention the gold. An expert brahmin takes out the fire and is followed by the officiant with the oblation if the sun has set *(yo brāhmaṇo bahuvit sa uddharet sarveṇaivainaṃ brahmaṇoddharaty agnihotreṇānudraved bhāgadheyenaivainaṃ praṇayaty atho bhāgadheyenaivainaṃ samardhayati varo dakṣiṇā sarvata evainaṃ digbhyo vareṇa cyāvayati)*. The expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya is quite similar: *agninā ca sahāgnihotreṇa coddraved bhāgadheyenaivainaṃ praṇayaty atho bhāgadheyenaivainaṃ samardhayati* (MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 8 f.). See also KS. 6, 6: 55. 4 ff. .. *agninā pūrveṇoddrutyāgnihotreṇānūddraved āhutyaivainaṃ cyāvayati yo brāhmaṇo bahuvit syāt sa uddharet sarveṇaivainaṃ brahmaṇoddharati yat purā dhanam adāyī syāt tad dadyād acyutenaivainaṃ cyāvayati*. The prāyaścitti of MS. hardly expiates the fact that the fire is taken out too late and evidently has been taken from the expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya. AB. combines both expiations: .. *ādityo 'bhyudiyād vābhyastam iyād vā praṇīto vā prāg ghomād upaśāmyet* .. (7, 12, 1). See also AthPr. 5, 1, where, in a rather corrupt text, the two expiations shade off into each other. TB. (which does not deal with the extinction of the āhavanīya; for this expiation see TS. 2, 2, 4, 7, where the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya, however, is rejected) introduces the gold as a significant particularity, but for the rest follows the expiation of MS.: *darbheṇa hiraṇyaṃ prabadhya purastād dharet athāgniṃ athāgnihotraṃ .. yad agniṃ pūrvaṃ haraty athāgnihotraṃ bhāgadheyenaivainaṃ praṇayati. brāhmaṇa ārṣeya uddharet. brāhmaṇo vai sarvā devatāḥ. sarvābhir evainaṃ devatābhir uddharati*. The gold preceding the expert brahmin represents the sunlight which he ought to see (though in reality it has already disappeared). In the morning expiation (which does not occur in MS.) instead of gold *caturgṛhītam ājyam* is carried in front of the expert brahmin *(etad vā agneḥ priyaṃ dhāma yad ājyaṃ priyeṇaivainaṃ dhāmnā samardhayati)*. Evidently this expiation is secondary since the

carrying in front has no function. AB. which follows TB. in the evening expiation *(hiraṇyam puraskṛtya sāyam uddharej jyotir vai śukraṃ hiraṇyam .. tad eva taj jyotiḥ śukram paśyann uddharati;* cf. TB. *jyotir vai hiraṇyaṃ jyotir evainaṃ paśyann uddharati)* takes the next step and introduces silver as a counterpart of gold in the morning expiation. This silver being the representation of the night *(etad rātrirūpam)*, i.e. of the situation that the sun still has not appeared, should not be carried before, in front of (or rather: for the eyes of, *puraskṛtya*) the one who takes out the fire, but should be hidden (*antardhāya prātar uddharet*; Keith' rendering "having interposed silver .." is rather obscure) since the sunlight should be hidden at that moment. The next change has been made by ŚB., which has reinterpreted *purastād* (TB. "en tête", translation Dumont, o.c., p. 248) as "eastward". Consequently *purastād* could no longer be connected with the gold which represents the setting sun (going westward). So *darbheṇa hiraṇyaṃ prabadhya purastād dharet* (TB.) was replaced by *haritaṃ hiraṇyaṃ darbhe prabadhya paścād dhartavai brūyāt.* Once again JB. borrowing from ŚB. also seems to have been influenced by TB. itself, the source of ŚB.: *sa darbheṇa suvarṇaṃ hiraṇyaṃ prabadhya paścād dharet.* The silver has been taken by ŚB. from AB. as the counterpart of gold for the morning expiation. Compare also *tac candramaso rūpaṃ kriyate rātrir vai candramās tad rātre rūpaṃ kriyate* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 7) with AB. 7, 12, 2 *rajatam antardhāya .. etad rātrirūpam.* This silver, however, is not concealed, but taken *purastād* (the counterpart of *parastād*), i.e. eastward. ŚB. has confused two aspects of the night in this expiation. The silver represents the moon according to this text. The moon, however, does not move eastward. The eastward movement refers to the nightly course of the sun, which does not set, but returns during the night to its place of departure in the east. See E. Sieg, "Der Nachtweg der Sonne", *Nachrichten K. G. W. Göttingen*, 1923, p. 1 ff. Every morning the fire should be taken out just before the eastward moving sun has reached its goal and is about to rise in the east. ŚB. and JB. prescribe the *caturgṛhītam ājyam* for the morning as well as the evening expiation (TB. 1, 4, 4, 3 has only in the morning expiation *caturgṛhītam ājyaṃ purastād dharet*). The version of JB. omits the passage *brāhmaṇa ārṣeya uddhared ..* (found in ŚB. and based on TB.).

The Taitt. sūtras agree with TB., but HirŚS. 15, 2, 20 states *agnihotraṃ pūrvaṃ hareyuḥ athāgnim uddhareyuḥ api vā darbheṇa hiraṇyaṃ prabadhya purastād dharet.* According to VaiŚS. 20, 12 f. first gold (sic), then butter and thereafter the agnihotra are taken to the āhavanīya at dawn. ĀśvŚS. 3, 12, 16 f. *(bahuvid brāhmaṇo 'gniṃ praṇayet darbhair hiraṇye 'grato hriyamāṇe; ... abhyudite caturgṛhītam ājyaṃ rajataṃ ca hiraṇyavad agrato hareyuḥ)* follows AB. as well as TB. See also BrahmPr. 49 a and 51 a (von Negelein, o.c., n. 778) *hiraṇyaṃ baddhvā darbheṇāgrato hareta paścād agnihotreṇānviyāt; ... caturgṛhītam ājyam agrato haret.* AthPr. 5, 1 (a rather corrupt passage) is partly based on MS. 1, 8, 7: *yo brāhmaṇo bahuvit syāt samuddharet* (read *sa uddharet) sarveṇainaṃ tad brāhmaṇa uddhared* (read *brahmaṇoddhared) yenāṃtarhita(ṃ) hiraṇyam agrato hared* (corrupt; AB. *rajatam antardhāya* refers to the morning expiation)

vāruṇaṃ yavamayaṃ caruṃ nirvaped (cf. TB. 1, 4, 4, 3) *ita eva prathamam iti* (cf. MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 10 f. in the expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya; for this confusion of the two expiations see above). AthPr. consists of several layers and the same expiation occurs AthPr. 1, 2 in a different form (borrowed from ŚB.): .. *ādityo 'bhyastam iyāt* .. *darbheṇa hiraṇyaṃ baddhvā paścād dhārayed ārṣeyas tat paśyann agnim āhavanīyam abhyuddharet* .. *ādityo 'bhyudiyāt* .. *darbheṇa rajataṃ baddhvā purastād dhārayed ārṣeyas tat paśyann* .. Probably AthPr. has not correctly understood the expiation of ŚB. and has mixed it up with prāyaścitti of AB. and TB. That the gold as well as the silver should be seen by the brahmin is quite out of place. Moreover this does not agree with the interpretation of ŚB., where *purastād* (like *parastād*) denotes a movement (and does not mean "for the eyes of, in front of"). In *purastād/parastād dhartavai* (JB. *dharet*) the root *hṛ-* (and not *dhṛ-*) has to be discerned. Cf. *prāñcaṃ hartavai* (JB. *hareyuḥ*). AthPr. seems to assume the root *dhṛ-* in *dhartavai*. In the same passage it has *hiraṇyam antardhārayed* (referring to the ordinary, timely taking out). Is *purastād, antar, parastād dhārayed* a late systematization? Or should one compare AB. *rajatam antardhāya*? Even KŚS. seems to misinterpret its own brāhmaṇa and assume the root *dhṛ-*: .. *kuśabaddhe hiraṇye paścād dhriyamāṇa idhmenoddhared ārṣeyo brāhmaṇaḥ* (25, 3, 17) .. *rajata dhāraṇaṃ purastāt* (25, 3, 20). According to the commentaries on KŚS. (see also the translation of the KŚS. passage *Śrautakośa* I, p. 146 and 148) the metals should be held to the rear of the gārhapatya and in front of the āhavanīya; the symbolism of which is, in my opinion, difficult to explain. ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 7 *purastād dhartavai brūyāt* .. *athedhmam ādīpyānvāñcaṃ hartavai brūyāt* clearly shows that the silver and the firebrand both are taken in the same direction, i.e. eastward, to the āhavanīya. The re- and misinterpretation of KŚS. is an indication that the oral and written tradition of the texts sometimes is more decisive than the tradition of the ritual practice itself. AgnPr. 12 b (von Negelein, o.c., n. 296) makes the confusion complete by combining *agrataḥ* (which continues TB. *purastād*) with *purastād* and *paścād* (as in ŚB., but reinterpreted) in an expiation which deals with the extinction of the āhavanīya (an expiation which is often confused with the present one, as was shown above): *(sāyaṃ) hiraṇyam agrato hṛtvāhavanīyasya paścād (hiraṇyaṃ) nidhāya prātaḥ rajatam agrato hṛtvāhavanīyasya purastān nidhāyeti viśeṣaḥ.*

62. — the sun should set, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Surely from him the All-gods[1] turn on whose āhavanīya the sun, when it has not yet been taken out, sets. Having tied up a piece of gold[2] with a bunch of grass he should take it to the west. Thereby a symbol is made of the one that shines there. That is a symbol of the day. Thus a symbol of the day is made.[3] Then they should kindle a firewood and take it to the east. Having laid it on (the āhavanīya) and having taken four ladles of clarified butter he

should offer it with "To the All-gods, *svāhā*". As it may happen in daily life[4] that one lures back[5] a guest who runs away by means of a full-grown cow or another favourite thing, in the same way he thereby lures back the All-gods. They all become free from anger towards him.

Now they further say: "If over his āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out, —

63. — the sun should rise, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Surely from him the All-gods turn over whose āhavanīya the sun, when it has not yet been taken out, rises. Having tied up a piece of silver with a bunch of grass he should take it to the east. Thereby a symbol of the moon is made. That is a symbol of the night. Thus a symbol of the night is made. Then they should kindle a firewood and take it in the same direction[6] (as that piece of silver). Having laid it on (the āhavanīya) and having taken four ladles of clarified butter he should offer it with "To the All-gods, *svāhā*". [Where there is a fire, there he should take out, knowing: "This (fire) here is found in the gārhapatya"][7] The implication[8] of this (offering) is the same (as in the preceding expiation). But some say: "These offer seeing heaven who (offer) seeing the sun". He now, indeed, should offer after sunrise who may have obtained all bliss or who may desire to leave this world soon.

Now they further say: —

NOTES

[1] The Viśve Devas are the rays of the sun according to the ŚB. version.

[2] *suvarṇaṃ hiraṇyam* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6 *haritaṃ hiraṇyam*) denotes gold in opposition to *rajataṃ hiraṇyam* "silver" in the next chapter.

[3] Compare these phrases with the ŚB. parallel and the similar phrases of the next chapter:

JB.	*tad etasya rūpaṃ kriyate ya eṣa tapaty ahno vā etad*	
ŚB.	*tad etasya rūpaṃ kriyate ya eṣa tapaty ahar vā etad*	
JB.	*rūpaṃ tad ahno rūpaṃ kriyate.*	
ŚB.	*ahno rūpaṃ kriyate.*	
JB.	*tac candramaso rūpaṃ kriyate*	*rātrer vā etad*
ŚB.	*tac candramaso rūpaṃ kriyate*	*rātrir vai candra-*
JB.	*rūpaṃ tad rātre rūpaṃ kriyate.*	
ŚB.	*mās tad rātre rūpaṃ kriyate.*	

Eggeling correctly translates ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6 *ahar vā etad ahno rūpaṃ kriyate* "and that (sun) being the day, it is made of the form of the day". As appears from the systematical arrangement of the parallels the ŚB. version of that sentence is corrupt. Before *ahno* one should insert *tad*. After that correction

the text seems to be preferable to the JB. version. JB., perhaps borrowing from the corrupt ŚB. text, may have failed to understand *etad* (representing *ya eṣa tapati*) and have inserted *rūpam*, after which the nom. *ahar* had to be changed into a gen. *ahno*.

[4] Read with Oertel *yathā vā adaḥ* (instead of *adavadaḥ*), the usual phrase with *adas* in comparisons. See Section 58-59, n. 7.

[5] JB. has replaced *upa mantrayate* (ŚB.) by *anu mantrayate*, which is equally correct in this context. The meaning "to call back, to beseech some one to come back, to lure someone back with a bait" is strikingly missing in the dictionaries s.v. *anumantrayate*. See ŚB. 1, 5, 2, 6 *(taṃ devā anvāmantrayantā naḥ śṛṇūpa na āvartasveti)*; 1, 6, 1, 5 (the Ṛtus have deserted to the Asuras and the gods say: *ṛtūn evānumantrayāmahā iti keneti* "(..) by means of what bait?"); 4, 4, 1, 16; JB. 3, 96 (*te hocur brāhmaṇaṃ vā anāryam apārāma. teṣāṃ no 'gner haro 'pākrāmīt. etainam anumantrayāmahā iti. tam anvamantrayanta. sa āgacchad yathā rājñā brāhmaṇo 'numantryamāṇa āgacched evam;* see Caland's translation *Auswahl*, p. 241). The difference between *upa-* and *anumantrayate* seems to be that the former means "to win a person (who has not necessarily already gone away) over to one's side", whereas the latter always implies a calling back. When Vāc leaves the gods in anger without deserting to the Asuras, the gods and the Asuras both try to win her *(upamantrayate)* ŚB. 3, 5, 1, 21. In the present passage *anumantrayate* of the JB. version may be more suitable than *upamantrayate* (ŚB.) in the context.

[6] I.e. to the āhavanīya, for the silver is taken *purastād*.

[7] *yatra vai dīptaṃ tatraitad iha gārhapatya ity eva vidvān uddharet* does not suit the context since the *uddharaṇa* does not follow the offering. Moreover this phrase (which is not found in 1, 62 and the ŚB. version) separates the passage ending with *iti juhuyāt* from *asāv eva bandhuḥ*, which refers to *tad yathā vā adaḥ* .., the passage immediately coming after *iti juhuyāt* in the preceding chapter. The mysteriously inserted clause may have a remote parallel in ĀpŚS. 9, 6, 12 *yasyāgnim anāhṛtaṃ sūryo 'bhinimroced yatra dīpyamānaṃ parāpaśyet tata āhṛtya* .. (which refers to the setting of the sun before the dakṣiṇāgni has been procured). In the present passage, however, the gārhapatya is mentioned. Is there any connection with the expiations which deal with the fire which is not produced during churning and for which any other fire may be substituted (cf. ĀpŚS. 9, 3, 3)? The clause has been interpolated for reasons that are not clear.

[8] For *bandhu* see Gonda, "Bandhu in the Brāhmaṇas", *Adyar Libr. Bull.* 39 (1965), p. 1 ff.

64–65. *The fires are mingled. One takes out fire to an āhavanīya which is still burning*

The brāhmaṇas and sūtras mention several cases of fires coming into contact: all (three) with each other, one of them with one other, all the fires with the fires of another sacrificer, with a village fire, with a forest conflagration, etc. Since the dedications of the oblations to the several forms of Agni (Vivici, Saṃvarga, etc.) are not used for the same expiations in the texts, it is difficult to ascertain what expiation is meant here at the beginning of JB. 1, 64 *(yadāgnayas saṃsṛjyeran)*. According to Eggeling's interpretation of the ŚB. parallel (12, 4, 4, 2) the fires of the sacrificer come into contact with each other. The expiation is twofold: a) *sa yadi parastād anyo 'bhidahann eyāt* (JB.); *sa yadi parastād dahann abhīyāt* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2) "If this burning (fire) were to come (to the other) from behind" (Eggeling). b) *yadi tv ayam ito 'bhidahann eyād* (JB.); *yad v ayam ito dahann abhīyāt* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 3) "If, however, this burning (fire) were to come from this side" (Eggeling). Eggeling's "from behind" and "from this side" do not make sense if one assumes (as E. seems to do) that the own fires come into contact with each other. What is the fire coming "from this side"? The two (?) fires mentioned in the text are not the āhavanīya and gārhapatya, as appears from JB. 1, 65, where the fusion of these two is discussed. The oblation to Agni Vivici and Saṃvarga occurs in different expiations in the texts and therefore does not from a strictly reliable criterion for the interpretation of this passage. The oblation to Agni Vivici is made in case all the fires come into contact according to AB. 7, 6, 3 and ĀśvŚS. 3, 13, 5. Compare, however, TB. 3, 7, 3, 5 *yasyāhitāgner anyair agnibhir agnayaḥ saṃsṛjyante agnaye vivicaye puroḍāśam aṣṭākapālaṃ nirvapet*. The Taitt. sūtras (followed by MŚS.) combine the contact between the own fires and with other fires in an offering to Agni Vivici. The oblation to Agni Saṃvarga is made according to AB. 7, 7, 1 and ĀśvŚS. 3, 13, 7, if the fires come into contact with a village fire. In this case, however, ŚŚS. 3, 4, 5 and AthPr. 2, 7; 5, 4 prescribe an oblation to Agni Vivici, whereas ŚŚS. connects Agni Saṃvarga with the forest conflagration. KŚS., the sūtra belonging to ŚB., prescribes the oblation to Agni Vivici in case the fires come into contact with each other, but an oblation is made to Agni Saṃvarga when a forest conflagration reaches the fires.

In view of this lack of unity among the parallels the ŚB. passage should be interpreted on the basis of its internal evidence. In my opinion it refers to the mingling of the sacrificer's fire (the constantly burning gārhapatya or his three fires taken as one) with another, unspecified fire. Then there are two possibilities: a) The contact is brought about by the other (JB. explicitly speaks of *anya-*) fire, which comes to the own fire (for JB. *abhi dahann* compare MS. 1, 8, 9: 129. 16 *yasyā bhy ādāvyena saṃsṛjyeta* and especially BhārŚS. 9, 5, 12 *atha yady abhyādāhyena*

saṃsṛjyeran vivicaye nirūpya ..). This is interpreted as a support sent by the gods. Compare the expiation for rain coming from outside the ritual sphere on the sacrifice (JB. 1, 56; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 10). The meaning of *parastād* is not so much "from behind" as "down upon, from outside (from afar, from behind, from before, from above) towards". It specifies the direction of the movement expressed by *abhi* in *abhidahan* (JB.) and *abhīyāt* (ŚB.) and contrasts with *itaḥ* at the end of JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 3). b) The own fire occasions the fusion by taking possession of another fire. Therefore one may, if desired, offer an oblation to Agni Saṃvarga, the Grasper. ŚB. even states that one should know *abhi dviṣantam bhrātṛvyam bhaviṣyāmi*, which must refer to coming in contact with (or "grasping") a fire which is not one's own.

For an indication that JB. has borrowed from ŚB. see n. 1. On the other hand JB. has taken one expiation directly from AB. The fusion of the āhavanīya and the gārhapatya is not found in the version of ŚB. and seems to have been borrowed by JB. 1, 65 from AB. 7, 6, 2.

For the expiation which deals with "taking out fire" to an āhavanīya which is still burning (JB. 1, 65) compare ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 4 f.; TS. 2, 2, 4, 6; MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 7 ff.; AB. 7, 6, 1. The parallels (except MS.) have the same yājyānuvākyās. The different position of this prāyaścitti in the arrangement of ŚB. (between the extinction of the āhavanīya and of the gārhapatya) may be due to the fact that ŚB. regards the āhavanīya when still burning as already "taken out" during the same sacrifice and as erroneously supposed to have become extinct. So this expiation links up with the preceding in ŚB. The fusion of two different fires is the aspect which interests JB. One has to assume a corruption in AthPr. 2, 7 *(yady anugatam abhyuddharet)* and 5, 4 *(ya āhavanīyam anugatam abhyuddharet)* and read *ananugatam.*

64. "If the fires should become mingled, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" If the other fire should come burning all the while up to (his fire) from outside, he should consider: "From outside 'light' has come up to me. My generative power has increased. I shall become more prosperous" (and) it would come to pass so. If, however, he could not put up with that in his heart, he should offer an oblation to Agni Vivici (the maker of a distinction). The same[1] fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these.[2] "Apart thy brilliant flames go, O brilliant Agni, driven in all directions by the wind. Mightily destroying they overpower the woods, boldly crushing them (like) divine Navagvas" (the puronuvākyā)[2] and the yājyā[2] "Thee, O Agni, the tribes of men praise as the knower of the sacrificial art, full of discrimination, a distributor of the greatest riches, visible to all, O fortunate one, even when concealed, energet-

ic, a good sacrificer, radiant with ghee". And if one should wish to get rid[3] of evil, one should perform this offering. Soon, forsooth, one gets rid of evil.

If, however, this (own) fire should come burning all the while from here to (the other fire), he should offer an oblation to Agni Saṃvarga (the Grasper). The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:[4] —

65. — "so much being at stake do not cast us off like a bearer his burden. Gathering in your winnings win wealth" (the puronuvākyā)[4] and the yājyā[4] "From the other side come over to this side.[5] Favour that (side)[5] to which I belong". And if one should wish to despoil *(saṃvivṛkṣeta)* one's rival, one should with that object in view perform this offering. Soon, indeed, one despoils him.

Now they further say: "If he should take out fire to a fire (which is still burning), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should offer an oblation to Agni Agnimat. The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:[6] "By Agni is Agni kindled, the wise poet, the youthful lord of the house, the bearer of oblations, in whose mouth the tongue (is a flame and at the same time) a sacrificial ladle"[7] (the puronuvākyā)[6] and the yājyā[6] "For thou, O Agni, art kindled by Agni, self being[8] an inspired seer and a comrade by an inspired seer and a comrade". If one should be desirous of pre-eminence in sacred knowledge, one should perform this offering. One becomes, indeed, brilliant and pre-eminent in sacred knowledge.

Now they further say: "If the āhavanīya and the gārhapatya fires should get mingled, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should offer an oblation to Agni Vīti.[9] The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:[10] "O Agni, come hither for the invitation (of the gods), being chanted (come hither) for the presentation of oblations (to the gods). Sit down on the sacrificial grass (as) a hotṛ" (the puronuvākyā)[10] and the yājyā[10] "Whoever seeks to win over Agni with oblations that he may invite the gods, be gracious to him, O pure one" "be gracious to him, O pure one".[11]

NOTES

[1] Instead of *etā eva pañcadaśa sāmidhenīr* ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2 reads *tā eva sapta daśa sāmidhenīr anubrūyād* "he should recite those same seventeen kindling-verses" (Eggeling). The use of *eva* in JB. can only be explained as due to borrowing from ŚB., no kindling-verses being mentioned before. ŚB. *eva* ("the same") refers (like 12, 4, 4, 1) to 12, 4, 3, 5 (where the same passage is found without *eva*).

[2] The *puronuvākyā* has been taken from TS. 3, 3, 11, 1 (= ṚV. 6, 6, 3), the *yājyā* from TS. 3, 3, 11, 2, which reads *tuviṣmaṇasam* instead of *tuviṣvaṇasam* (ṚV. 5, 8, 3, followed by the version of ŚB.).

[3] *vyāvartate* is construed with the instr. and (in the next clause) with the abl. (cf. JB. 1, 15 f. exhibiting the same alternation). For the conception that separating good and bad (i.c. the own, good fire and the other, bad fire) brings about a deliverance from evil (i.c. from the other fire) see also Section 15-16, n. 1.

[4] JB. has transposed the *puronuvākyā* and the *yājyā*, but even the ŚB. combination seems to be secondary. The yājyā *mā no asmin mahādhane* (ṚV. 8, 75, 12; SV. 2, 1000; for our translation see Renou, *E.V.P.* 13, p. 157) should be accompanied by the anuvākyā *kuvit su no gaviṣṭaye* (ṚV. 8, 75, 15; SV. 2, 999). See TS. 2, 6, 11, 3; KS. 7, 17; MS. 4, 11, 6; AB. 7, 7, 1; ĀśvŚS. 3, 13, 12; ŚŚS. 3, 5, 4; ĀpŚS. 19, 25, 12. The ŚB. anuvākyā *parasyā adhi saṃvataḥ* (ṚV. 8, 75, 15) should be followed by the yājyā *vidmā hi te purā vayam* (ṚV. 8, 75, 16). See TS. 2, 6, 11, 3 f. with Keith' translation and note. For the yājyānuvākyā of ŚB./JB. perhaps one may compare KS. 7, 17: 82. 5 ff. where the pāda *parasyā adhi saṃvataḥ* directly follows on *mā no asmin mahādhane* (which is, however, preceded by *kuvit su no gaviṣṭaye*). SV. reads *agne* for *asmin*.

[5] JB. agrees with MS. 2, 7, 7: 83. 3 f. in reading *'varam* (or *avaram*) and *tam* for *'varān* and *tān*.

[6] The anuvākyā (ṚV. 1, 12, 6) and the yājyā (ṚV. 8, 43, 14) occur together i.a. TS. 1, 4, 46, 3; AB. 7, 6, 1 (in the same expiation) and BŚS. 13, 7.

[7] For *juhvāsya-* see Geldner's note on ṚV. 1, 12, 6: "Agni's Mund besteht nur aus seinen Zungen = Flammen (..) Doch wäre nach der geläufigeren Bedeutung von juhū auch möglich: dessen Mund der Opferlöffel ist" and Renou's translation (*E.V.P.* 12, p. 2) "qui (reçoit en sa) bouche (le contenu de) la cuiller-oblatoire". The compound should be taken as a bahuvrīhi of the type *asipāṇi* "whose hand is with a sword" in which *juhū* should mean *à double entente* "tongue" and "flame" or/and "ladle". Compare Keith' translation AB. 1, 16, 28 "with the ladle in his mouth".

[8] For this interpretation of *san satā* see Renou, *E.V.P.* 13, p. 153.

[9] In the context of the expiation *vīti* obviously means "the going apart", but in the yājyānuvākyās *vīti* does not derive from *vi-i- (vyeti)*, but from *vī- (veti)*. The yājyānuvākyās are often rather forcedly connected with the accidents to be expiated. For this etymologizing reinterpretation of *vīti* compare TS. 5, 1, 5, 8 and ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 22 f. (see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 572).

[10] The puronuvākyā and yājyā are ṚV. 8, 60, 1 and 1, 12, 9.

[11] The repetition indicates that the agnihotra section (see the appar. crit. of Raghu Vira's edition) has reached its close.

I. AGNIṢṬOMA (JB. 1, 66–178)

W. Caland-V. Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, Paris 1906–1907 [= *CH*]; A. Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur. Vedische Opfer und Zauber*, Strassburg 1897, 124–134 [= *Ritual-Litteratur*]; A.B. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1925, 326–332; P.V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, II, 2, Poona 1941, 1133–1203; *Śrautakośa* II, Sanskrit Section, Part I (ed. C.G. Kashikar), Poona 1970; English Section, Part I–II (ed. R.N. Dandekar), Poona 1973–1982; J.F. Staal, "The Twelve Ritual Chants of the Nambudiri Agniṣṭoma", *Pratidānam* (Fel. Vol. F.B.J. Kuiper), The Hague 1968, 409–429; *Agni: The Vedic Ritual of the Fire Altar*, I, 579–686.

PB. 6–8, 7; ṢaḍvB. 1–2; JŚS. 1, 8–18; LŚS. 1–2; DŚS. 1–6.

I. 1. *The morning service (and general introduction)* (1, 66–115)

I. 1. 1. *Introductory chapters* (1, 66–81)

I. 1. 1. 1. *Explanation of the name Agniṣṭoma/Jyotiṣṭoma* (66)

TS. 7, 1, 1, 1; 7, 1, 2, 1; PB. 6, 3, 6; 10, 2, 2; 16, 1, 6.

Agni is the generative[1] light (*jyoti*) among the gods, the Virāj the light ⟨among the metres, the Virāj is the light of speech⟩.[2] In Agni it (i.e. the Agniṣṭoma)[3] ends. It is (also) correlated with the Virāj[4]. Therefore this (sacrifice) is called the Jyoti (*ṣṭoma*)[5]. Two Stomas (lauds) draw the (chariot of the) morning pressing, like sight and breath, two Stomas draw the midday pressing, like hearing and the two arms, two Stomas draw the afternoon pressing, like the middle and the foundation (i.e. the two feet)[6].

With light in the form of the exclamation *him*[7] the gods gave light to the Trivṛt (Stoma)[8], (which is) splendour obtained by wisdom[9]. With the Trivṛt splendour they gave light to the Fifteenfold (Stoma), (which is) force and strength[10]. With the Fifteenfold (Stoma), with force and strength they gave light to the Seventeenfold (Stoma), (which is) offspring, cattle and procreation[11]. With the Seventeenfold (Stoma), with offspring, cattle and procreation, they gave light to the Twenty-onefold (Stoma), (which is) support[12].

Thus each Stoma continually places light in another Stoma[13]. Therefore it is called a Jyotiṣṭoma. And because the one Stoma[14] leads the other Stoma to a (new) pressing, it is called a Jyotiṣṭoma. And because the sacrifice, when it is chanted through to the end, correlates with the Virāj[15]—and the Virāj is light (*jyotis*)—therefore it is called a Jyotiṣṭoma.

I. 1. 1. 2. *The mythical origin of the rite* (67–69)

Caland, *Das Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl* [= *Auswahl*], Amsterdam 1919, 14–15; Oertel, *Transactions Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* [= *TCAAS*] 15 (1909), 175–180; 196–201; K. Mylius, *Älteste indische Dichtung und Prosa*, Leipzig, 1981, 133–134.

TS. 7, 1, 1, 2–6; PB. 6, 1.

67. This sacrifice which corresponds to man is not handicapped (lit. "yoked with a single horse")[1]. If one undertakes it with a wish, this wish becomes fulfilled for him. For with a (chariot which is) not handicapped, one goes where one wants to go[2].

When Prajāpati created the creatures, he created them by means of the Agniṣṭoma. He created them by means of the tenth laud of the Agniṣṭoma and the tenth[3] month of the year. By means of the twelfth laud of the Agniṣṭoma he enclosed them and by means of the twelfth month of the year. Therefore the mammals bear their foetuses during ten months. They bring forth in the course of the eleventh. No female passes the twelfth month (of pregnancy), for she[4] is enclosed (i.e. limited in the duration of her pregnancy) by this.

Of them who had been enclosed[5] the he-mule escaped[6]. Running after him he took his seed away. This he smeared on the ass, then on the mare, then on the (other) animals, then on the plants. Therefore the ass doubly impregnates, therefore the mare is doubly impregnated. Therefore animals may produce a double offspring (i.e. twins). Therefore, even if the plants are not anointed (with ghee), they light up (in the fire)[7]. Therefore the mule is not to be given (as a Dakṣiṇā) on the sacrificial straw[8]. For he escaped and ran off[9]. And because his seed has been taken away and he has no offspring. He may be given on the occasion of the Stotra of the Ṣoḍaśin sacrifice. For the Ṣoḍaśin is the excessive one among the Stotras[10]; the mule is the excessive one among the mammals. Thereby he places something excessive with something excessive, for the sake of the correspondence of the sacrifice.[11] He who knowing thus sings the Sāmans of the Agniṣṭoma brings forth offspring fit to be born at that moment[12] and keeps together those who have been born[11]. The Agniṣṭoma is the best sacrifice, it is Prajāpati's sacrifice. He who knows thus obtains the best and most excellent position[13].

68. Prajāpati (and nothing else) existed here[14] in the beginning. Now Prajāpati was the (vital) power mind[15]. He desired: "May I become manifold. May I procreate. May I become abundant". He created from his top, from his head[16], the Trivṛt laud, the Gāyatrī metre, the Rathantara melody, the deity Agni, the human being Brahmin, the animal goat. Therefore the Brahmin has the Gāyatrī as his metre and Agni as his deity. And therefore also he is the head of the creatures. For he (Prajāpati) created him from the head.

He desired: "May I procreate". He created from both his arms and from his breast the Fifteenfold laud, the Triṣṭubh metre, the Bṛhat melody, the deity Indra, the human being Kṣatriya, the animal horse. Therefore the Kṣatriya has the Triṣṭubh as his metre and Indra as his deity. And therefore also he displays his force with his arms. For he (P.) created him from his two arms, from his breast, from his force.

He desired: "May I procreate".

69. He created from his belly, from his middle, the Seventeenfold laud, the Jagatī metre, the Vāmadevya melody, the deity All-gods, the human being Vaiśya and the animal cow. Therefore the Vaiśya has the Jagatī as his metre and the All-gods as his deity. And therefore he is always intent on producing (procreating). For he (P.) created him from his belly, from his generative organ.

He desired: "May I procreate". He created from his two feet, from his support, the Twenty-onefold laud, the Anuṣṭubh metre, the Yajñāyajñīya melody, no deity at all, the human being Śūdra and the animal sheep. Therefore the Śūdra has the Anuṣṭubh as his metre and the landlord as his deity. And therefore he desires to earn his living by washing feet. For he was born from the support (feet) of Prajāpati.

With this creation Prajāpati created the creatures. He who thus knows this becomes abundant with offspring and with cattle. Therefore they praise this sacrifice, the Agniṣṭoma, as being the best. For it is the sacrifice of Prajāpati.

I. 1. 1. 3. *The raising of the Udumbara pillar* (70–72)

CH, 94–97; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (English Section), 309–312; (Sanskrit Section), 164–174; Bodewitz, *Sternbach Felic. Vol.*, Lucknow 1979, 77–82; Staal, *Agni*, I, 579–583.

PB. 6, 4; JŚS. 1, 6; LŚS. 1, 7; DŚS. 2, 3.

70. Prajāpati distributed his strength for the creatures[1]. Then the Udumbara tree came into existence. The Udgātṛ is related to Prajāpati[2], the Udumbara is related to Prajāpati. One elects the other priests, but not the Udgātṛ. When the Udgātṛ through his first act takes hold[3] of the Udumbara pillar, he thereby elects himself for the function of priest by means of his own deity. He takes hold of it (with the formula): "I place you in the seat of life[4], in the shelter of the helping one[5], in the heart of the ocean[6]. Salutation to the ocean, salutation to the eye of the ocean[7]. May Yonorvan (?) not leave me[8]." When he says: "I place you in the seat of life" (Āyu)—Āyu is the sacrifice—its place is made here. When he says: "In the shelter of the helping one"—the sacrifice helps[9]—a shelter is made here in the form of the Sadas hut. That he says: "In the heart of the ocean"—the heart is in the middle of the trunk (of a living being)—therefore the Udumbara pillar is erected[10] in the middle of the

Sadas hut. When he says: "Salutation to the ocean, salutation to the eye of the ocean"—the ocean is speech, the eye of the ocean is mind—he thereby utters a salutation to these two vital powers[11], when he is on the verge of performing his priestly function[12]. When he says: "May Yonorvan not leave me"—Yonorvan is the Sāman—he thereby utters a salutation to the Sāman, when he is on the verge of performing his priestly function[12]. The Sāman does not carry him away. He does not come to distress which is connected with the Sāman. He who knowing thus utters a salutation to the Sāman does not fall short of (the duty of correctly singing) the Sāman. He who criticizes him, comes to distress.

71. The Sadas hut is Prajāpati's belly[13]. The Udumbara wood is strength (life-sap)[14]. When the Udumbara pillar is erected[10] in the middle of the Sadas hut, one thereby places food, life-sap, in the middle (i.e. belly) of the creatures[15]. Therefore the eating of food gives satisfaction in the middle (i.e. belly)[16]. Therefore people become hungry, when this (pillar) is made (of wood which is) mouldered[17]. They become, however, prospering . . .[18].

They consider: "Should there be touched or not[19] (i.e. should the Udgātṛ touch the pillar or not while singing the Sāman)?" Everything here is animated (i.e. has a soul). If indeed now someone shows as it were (by taking hold of it) that his desire is directed towards[20] food, this (food) hates him very much. If he should touch (the pillar which means food), he would blow away[21] the food. If he should not touch, he would deprive himself of the food. Indeed touching (the pillar) there should be sung[22] (by the Udgātṛ) in a very free way (hardly 'touching' the verse on which the Sāman is based)[23]. One does not blow the food away; one does not deprive oneself of the food.

The Sāman is the food of the gods[24], the Udumbara is life-sap. When the Udgātṛ leans[25] on the Udumbara pillar, he thereby places the food of the gods, the life-sap, in the Sāman. Therefore the gods eat rather[26] most, when the sacrificial service is performed with a Sāman.

72. The Udgātṛ is Prajāpati[27], the Udumbara pillar is life-sap. As such this Prajāpati allots life-sap, food, to the creatures, because he is leaning[25] on the life-sap (because he has recourse to life-sap). The Udgātṛ sings with his face directed to the north ⟨because the Udgātṛs are connected with the northern deities⟩[28]. Thereby he apportions life-sap to the northern quarter. The Prastotṛ sings sitting with his face directed to the west. Thereby he apportions life-sap to the western quarter. The Pratihartṛ sings sitting with his face directed to the south. Thereby he apportions life-sap to the southern quarter[29]. The other priests perform their functions directed to the east. Thereby they apportion life-sap to the eastern quarter. Therefore this quarter, being the strongest of the quarters and affording the best livelihood, is fa-

voured by most people[30]. When, therefore, people fall into[31] absence of livelihood, they go east. For this is favoured by most people as the strongest of the quarters and as affording the best livelihood.

Now they say: "[If the Udgātṛs (admittedly) are connected with the northern deities, (one may ask then):][28] "For what reason do they (i.e. the Udgātṛ and his assistants) perform their functions distributed over the quarters?"[32] One should say: "In order to honour[33] the quarters, in order to please[34] the quarters. Therefore food is found in all the quarters".

He should offer over the Udumbara pillar with the formulas: ["Support heaven, fill the air, fasten the earth with your lower part"[35]. "Let Dyutāna, the son of the Maruts, erect you with the stable support of Mitra and Varuṇa"[36]] "Heaven and earth, be pleased with ghee"[37]. "Make the crops bear good grains, hail"[38].

I. 1. 1. 4. *The placing of the Droṇakalaśa and the chanting of the Viśvarūpā verses* (73–76)

CH §130 (Droṇakalaśa) and §120 (Viśvarūpā); *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (E.S.), 385–386; 430; (S.S.), 242–244; Caland, *Auswahl*, 15–16; Oertel, *JAOS* 23 (1902), 326–328; Staal, *Agni*, I, 601.

PB. 6, 5; ṢaḍvB. 1, 4; JŚS. 1, 8; LŚS. 1, 8, 5–16; DŚS. 2, 4, 6–24.

73. Prajāpati created the creatures. He also wished to create Agni, from his mouth. Agni, loathing from his mouth and running upwards, pushed his skull[1] upwards when he was created. The gods and the seers together came to this (skull) and said: "This skull which has been pushed off (from the head) should not be lost. Let us think about it what we can do with it[2]". They said to Bṛhaspati[3]: "Use it as (*droṇakalaśa*) cup for the Soma". Bṛhaspati said: "It is horrible, so to say, it is unclean, filthy (impure)[4] and raw". They said: "We make it clean, pure and cooked". "Give it to me". "Yes". They gave it to him. He received it with the formula: "I receive you at the instigation of god Savitṛ with the arms of the Aśvins and with the hands of Pūṣan"[5]. Thereby he received it with the limbs of the gods. Having received it he purified it with the mantras: "Let the Vasus purify you with the Gāyatrī, you who procure good offspring and increase of riches. Let the Rudras purify you with the Triṣṭubh metre, you who. Let the Ādityas purify you with the Jagatī metre, you who." Thereby he purified it with the metres and the gods. Having purified it (i.e. the *droṇakalaśa* cup) he (i.e. the Udgātṛ)[6] places it behind the axle (of the Havirdhāna cart) reciting: "You are connected with Bṛhaspati, with the forest tree, you are the head of Prajāpati, the surpassing (?)[7] vessel". That he says "You are connected with Bṛhaspati" is because Bṛhaspati received it in the

beginning. That he says: "connected with the forest trees" is because they (actually) produce it from trees. That he says: "You are the head of Prajāpati" is because this was the head of Prajāpati. That he says: "the surpassing[7] vessel" is because this vessel surpasses (the duration of use of) the other vessels. Because this vessel is used first and discarded last, therefore it surpasses (the duration of) the other vessels. He who knows thus obtains a vessel (i.e. plenty) of fortune.

Having placed it beyond the axle he sings the Gāyatra melody on the Viśvarūpā verses[8].

74. "Homage to the Pitṛs who have taken their seats before[9], homage to those (priests) who jointly have taken seat". "I yoke speech which has a hundred feet; I sing (the Sāman) that has a thousand paths[10], which consists of the Gāyatrī, the Triṣṭubh, the Jagatī, which is the concentration[11] of all forms which the gods have made their abodes".

That he says "Homage to the Pitṛs who have taken their seats before"—indeed the Pitṛs used to sit there before—thereby he pays[12] homage to them now. By saying "Homage to those who jointly have taken seat" he pays homage to those brahmins with whom he takes seat in order to act as a priest. By saying "I yoke speech which has a hundred feet" he actually yokes (i.e. starts to employ) speech which has a hundred feet. When he says "I sing (the Sāman) which has a thousand paths" he thereby sings the yoked speech which has become consisting of thousand paths. When he sings "which consists of the Gāyatrī, the Triṣṭubh, the Jagatī",—for those are the three pressings—then he places these (pressings) in himself. When he says: "which is the concentration of all forms"—for the sacrifice is all forms—he thereby brings together the sacrifice. When he says: "(which) the gods have made their abode" he thereby makes the sacrifice connected with the gods.

75. Kusurbinda[13], the son of Uddālaka acted as an Udgātṛ at Soma sacrifices[14]. The sons of the Kaśyapas said about him: "Who now[15] is this mischievous man who performs the office of the Udgātṛ in our presence? Come, let us cry him down". They sat down near the place where Stotras are sung with the intention to cry him down. He said: "Homage (to you) o Brahmins. I have just concentrated (or: completed)[16] the sacrifice before the morning-recitation by means of the Gāyatra melody sung on the Viśvarūpā verses. Just as some one who drives cattle[17] may bring together the weak and the tired, we bring together this body of the sacrifice". They arose and drove away saying: "Homage there must be to this Brahmin. He knows it". For him who knows thus, the sacrifice becomes performed in concentrated form before the morning recitation by means of the Gāyatra Sāman sung on the Viśvarūpā verses.

76. [18]Now they say with regard to this: "O Adhvaryu, after the singing

of what laud did the Hotṛ recite the morning recitation?" "We have done what is our work" he said; "ask the Hotṛ". "O Hotṛ, after the singing of what laud did you recite the morning recitation?" "We have done what is our work" he said; "ask the Udgātṛ". "O Udgātṛ, after the singing of what laud did the Hotṛ recite the morning recitation?" "We have done what is our work" he said; "we have sung what there should be sung here". If they should say to him: "You have sung darkness and not lights" he should say: "I did sing the lights and not the darkness. The Ṛc is a light, the Sāman is a light, the deity is a light. These lights did I sing. Let me pierce you with the evil of darkness". And he pierces them with the evil of darkness.

I. 1. 1. 5. *The pushing forwards of the Droṇakalaśa* (77–78)

CH §130; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (E.S.), 421–431; (S.S.), 257–260
PB. 6, 5; JŚS. 1, 9; LŚS. 1, 9, 20–26; DŚS. 3, 1, 18–23.

77. They (i.e. the Udgātṛ and his assistants) sit down behind (the axle) with their faces directed towards the east. Thereby they obtain speech in front of themselves. If they were to sit down before (i.e. to the east of) the axle with their faces directed towards the east, they would produce speech behind themselves. Their speech would become failing.

Speech ran away from the gods. She entered the trees. It is she[1] who is present (i.e. makes noise) in the axle. When they push forwards the Droṇakalaśa beneath the axle, he (i.e. the sacrificer) thereby obtains divine speech. The Udgātṛs push forwards the Droṇakalaśa beneath the axle for the function of Udgātṛ[2]. Thereby he excludes the hating rival from this world. They take away the strainer[3] (from the Droṇakalaśa) above the axle[4]. He who knows thus thereby excludes the hating rival from yonder world.

One should not touch the axle. If one should touch the axle, one would smear[5] glory on the rival. He pushes (it) forwards between the two wheels. Therefore that which is between the two wheels of a cart affords the best livelihood[6]. Therefore it is useful to yoke (the ox) between two yoke pins.

78. The Vasus pushed forwards this (Droṇakalaśa) in the beginning. They became tired. They summoned the Rudras. Then the Rudras pushed it forwards. They became tired and they summoned the Ādityas. Then the Ādityas pushed it forwards. He pushes it forwards with the formulas "The Vasus must push you forwards with the Gāyatrī metre. The Rudras must push you forwards with the Triṣṭubh metre. The Ādityas must push you forwards with the Jagatī metre". Thereby he pushes it forwards in accordance with the pushing forwards[7] of the gods. Or he should push it forwards with the formula "I push you forwards at

the instigation of god Savitṛ with the arms of the Aśvins and with the hands of Pūṣan"[8]. Thereby he pushes it forwards with the limbs of the gods. Bṛhaspati pushed it forwards in the beginning. He was deprived of his form (or: beauty) and spiritual lustre. He thought: "What is the expiation for this?". He discovered it to be in the Droṇakalaśa. He touched it saying: "You are protecting the body. Protect my body. You are procuring lustre. Procure lustre for me. You are giving life. Give life to me. You are giving physical strength. Give physical strength to me". Thereby he makes the body swell with that part of it with which it had become diminished on that occasion. With the same formulas the Udgātṛ touches (the Droṇakalaśa): "You are protecting the body. Protect my body. You are procuring lustre. Procure lustre for me. You are giving life. Give life to me. You are giving physical strength. Give physical strength to me"[9]. Thereby he makes his body swell with that part of it with which it had become diminished on that occasion. There are two things here: the Brahmin class and the Kṣatriya class. Both belong to the Droṇakalaśa[10]. He who knows thus gets into his power both the Brahmin and the Kṣatriya classes.

I. 1. 1. 6. *The pushing of the Droṇakalaśa on the pressing stones* (79–80)

CH §130; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (E.S.), 421–431; (S.S.), 257–260; PB. 6, 6, 1–5; JŚS. 1, 9; LŚS. 1, 10, 1–16; DŚS. 3, 2, 1–21

79. Having put the pressing stones (with their thick ends) joined (litt. "face to face") he touches them with the formula "You swift falcons, offspring of cosmic order, children of Prayut[1], summits of the mountains, lead hither for us the hero, by whom we are in great numbers supported in our livelihood, who makes imprecations and is blameless himself, who imprecates others"[2]. For him is born a hero who makes imprecations and is blameless himself, who imprecates others.

He pushes the Droṇakalaśa on (the pressing stones saying) "I push myself here on spiritual lustre"[3]. If he has a king (as sacrificer) who has become expelled, he should put the pressing stones (with their thick ends) unconnected, silently push the Droṇakalaśa on (them) and shaking it down[4] he should push it off to the left, saying "I push off here so and so away from his people"[5]. Saying "I overthrow here his monarchy"[6] he should turn the Droṇakalaśa upside down. Having put the pressing stones (with their thick ends) joined he should take the name of his (own) king (for whom he sacrifices) and place the Droṇakalaśa on (them) saying: "I push so and so on his people"[7]. The one (king) becomes expelled, the other comes into power. If now this (king) having come into power does not respect him, he (i.e. the priest)

should desire: "he should become besieged ("isolated")[8] on this very spot within (his kingdom)". Having put the pressing stones (with their thick ends) unconnected and having silently pushed the Droṇakalaśa on them he should place the pressing stone which is called *upāṃśusavana* (i.e. used for pressing the silent draught)[9] on it, saying: "Here I push the people[10] on so and so". The people overcome him, because his might is waning and he is bereft of his support (subjects)[11]. If he should discover him (as the cause of his distress) and have recourse to him with the words "I have hereby deputed to this brahmin, whatever I proclaim[12] here to him in an official announcement"[13], he (the priest) should put the pressing stones (with their thick ends) joined and should push the Droṇakalaśa on (them, saying) "I push so and so on his people". He is master of his own men, his own men respect[14] him, his neighbouring rival[15] becomes expelled.

80. The Droṇakalaśa is the royal power[16], the pressing stones are the peoples (or: the people)[17]. If the Droṇakalaśa should be unsteady, the royal power would be unsteady. Consequent upon[18] this (royal power) the peoples, consequent upon (the unsteadiness of) the people the sacrificer[19], consequent upon (the unsteadiness or weakness of) the sacrificer his subjects (become weak). He fixes it with the formula "May the two divine bowls (i.e. heaven and earth)[20] protect you; sit down on a steady seat; sit down for sap and pith"[21]. The two divine bowls are these two worlds, the steady seat is this earth. By means of these worlds he thereby fixes it. (As to) "Sit down for sap and pith": (the words) "for sap" mean rain; what grows after the rain, that is (denoted by) "for pith". This he thereby obtains.

I. 1. 1. 7. *The wiping of the Droṇakalaśa with the strainer. Explanation of the colour of the strainer. The spreading of the strainer and the addressing of the stream of Soma* (80 continued–81)

CH § 130–131; *Śrautakośa* §II, 2 (E.S.), 452–453; II, 1 (S.S.), 273–275; Oertel, *JAOS* 26, 190 ff.

PB. 6, 6, 6–19; JŚS. 1, 9; LŚS. 1, 10, 17–24; DŚS. 3, 2, 22–34

80. Svarbhānu[1], one of the Asuras, struck the sun with darkness. The gods and the Seers tried to cure him. They said to Atri: "O, Seer, ward off this (darkness)". "Yes" (he said). Atri warded it off. They said: "He who found light for us, when we were struck by darkness, to his share light must fall". Therefore gold is presented to a descendant of Atri[2]. Formerly gold weighing a hundred Manas used to be given. But nowadays they give how much soever. Gold forsooth is light everywhere. He who knowing thus gives gold to a descendant of Atri obtains light everywhere.

81. What he repelled first, became a black sheep. What he repelled the second time, became a grey sheep. What he repelled the third time, became a reddish sheep. If (the priest) should wish: "May he (the sacrificer) become worse", he should insert a black thread in his strainer. Indeed he becomes worse. And if he should wish: "May he become neither worse nor better", he should insert a grey thread in his strainer. He becomes neither worse nor better. And if he should wish: "May he become better, may he obtain lustre", he should make his strainer reddish[3]. He becomes better and obtains lustre. For even therein something of the nature of the sun is present[4].

Having taken away this (strainer) between the two poles of the cart he wipes (the Droṇakalaśa, saying) "let the Vasus wipe you clean with the Gāyatrī metre. Let the Rudras wipe you clean with the Triṣṭubh metre. Let the Ādityas wipe you clean with the Jagatī metre"[5].

Then he spreads out the strainer with the fringe towards the north with the formula which contains the word strainer "Your strainer, o Brahmaṇaspati, is spread out", in order to obtain goods[6]. For a sacrificer who wants to go to heaven with "The strainer of the glowing one is spread in heaven" and with "The speckled (bull) stepping in front has caused to shine the dawns"[7] for someone who desires offspring. He should spread out (the strainer) with all (the three verses) in order to obtain all these aims.

He pours king (Soma) on (the strainer) and addresses him with the verses "Purify yourself, you with good form, and come to our manifestations which are dear to the gods"[8]; "Thrice you have purified yourself for the gods, thrice for the Ādityas[9], thrice for the Aṅgirasas. Purify yourself for me with the fourth formula with which you have purified yourself for Bṛhaspati"[10]. "Purify yourself for us, for the benefit of cattle, people and horses, for the benefit, o king (Soma), of the plants"[11]. He becomes beneficent for the Udgātṛ, beneficent for the sacrificer, beneficent for the (sacrificer's) subjects (or: the offspring).

The Adhvaryu while drawing the new grain draught (*āgrayaṇagraha*) produces the sound *him*. Thereby the (introductory) *hiṃkara*[12] has been made. Now the Udgātṛ sings the Gāyatra consisting of one verse: "In the highest it was produced by you, the plant"[13]. 'Upwards'[14] he conveys the oblation from here to the gods. With (the second pāda) "I take (the Soma) which is in heaven to earth" he makes the rain flow down from heaven. He makes the two worlds associated[15](?). These two worlds have abundance (of food) agreeably to his wish[16]. For him who knows thus these two worlds have abundance (of food) agreeably to his wish.

I. 1. 2. *The Bahiṣpavamāna* (1, 82–104)

CH §134; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 454–469; II, 1 (S.S.), 276–291; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 413; 416–417; *Agni*, I, 602–605; Fujii, "The Bahiṣpavamāna ritual of the Jaiminīyas", *Machikaneyama Ronso* (Osaka, 1986), 2–25.

JB. 1, 245–250; 315–321; PB. 6, 7–10; ṢaḍvB. 2, 1–3; JŚS. 1, 10–11; LŚS. 1, 11–12; 2, 1; DŚS. 3, 3–4; 4, 1.

I. 1. 2. 1. *The slow moving (sarpaṇa) to the Out-of-doors Pavamāna laud* (82–86)

CH §134 b–c; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 454–458; II, 1 (S.S.), 276–278; Oertel, *Roots and Verb-Forms*, 100–101 (1, 82); Caland, *Auswahl*, 16–17 (1, 85)

PB. 6, 7; JŚS. 1, 10; LŚS. 1, 11, 2–18; 1, 12, 1–6; DŚS. 3, 3, 11–27; 3, 4, 16–21

82. They perform the cruel part so to say of the sacrifice, when they kill king Soma with the pressing stones in the Havirdhāna shed and then move slowly (litt.: creep) to the Out-of-doors laud[1]. "What is the expiation for this?" they say. They should touch water. Water is a means of appeasing everything[2]. Thus he appeases it with water. In the beginning Speech slowly moving[3] to the out-of-doors *pavamāna* laud was (too) lazy[4] for this march. Prajāpati said to her: "I will make a share[5] for you. Move". Going to move[6] slowly to the out-of-doors *pavamāna* laud he[7] should sacrifice an oblation (muttering): "May I be pleasing to Speech, pleasing to the lord of speech. O divine Speech, what of your speech is sweetest[8], in that you may place me. Hail to Sarasvatī"[9]. If he should offer with "To Sarasvatī hail" (i.e. reversing the position of *svāhā* "hail"), he would close in Sarasvatī, (i.e.) Speech, with the exclamation *svāhā*. When he offers with "Hail to Sarasvatī", he places Speech after *svāhā*. With her, not[10] being closed in, he extends[11] (sets up, performs) the sacrifice. For the sacrifice is extended upwards by means of speech. Or he should offer with "Bekurā by name you are, sent out for the divine work; be auspicious (and) easy to be regulated for us, a realized wish for the sacrificer, hail"[12]. Bekurā is Speech. Speech is Brahman. Thereby having offered an oblation to Speech, to Brahman, he moves slowly (and) does not suffer any injury.

83. Those who slowly move to the out-of-doors *pavamāna* laud go to the forest as it were. A Rakṣas demon or an other destructive demon[13] may probably[14] kill them. And (therefore) he offers a second oblation (with the formulas) "The Sun-god must protect me from demons from heaven, the Wind(-god) from those from the intermediate space, the Fire from those from earth, hail"[15]. Having intrusted himself to these overlords of these worlds, he slowly moves (to the out-of-doors laud and) does not suffer any injury. When Prajāpati emitted the sacrifice, he emitted it in the Havirdhāna. Having been emitted it moved north-

wards. On that occasion[16] having obtained it here[17] they praised it. At the moment when having gone northward[18] they praise with the Out-of-doors laud, they thereby praise after having obtained the sacrifice.

He who knows the divine swift horse (*vājin*), becomes possessed of strength (or: booty) (*vājin*). The divine swift horse is the sacrifice. Even if indeed someone mounts a normal (litt.: human) horse without appeasing and stroking[19] it, it injures or destroys him. How much more if he should mount a divine horse without appeasing and stroking it.

84. The Adhvaryu slowly moves forward taking a bunch of grass (*prastara*). He (i.e. the Udgātṛ) accompanies him with the formula "Hereby I stroke (or: cleanse?) the divine horse"[20]. He mounts the (divine horse which is) stroked (cleansed?) and appeased (and) does not suffer any injury.

Those who act as an Udgātṛ for a Soma sacrifice, take up their abode[21] in the domain of the gods. Even if indeed someone takes up his abode without[22] notifying the human owner of a field, he injures him or chases him away. How much more if he should take up his abode without notifying the divine owner of the field. He says: "O Soma, sing as a chanter, as a chanter sing, O Soma"[23]. Soma is the divine owner of the field. Having notified Soma, the divine owner of the field, he acts as an Udgātṛ (and) does not suffer any injury. "On my behalf for glory, on my behalf for spiritual lustre, on my behalf for food, on my behalf for wealth, on my behalf for prosperity, on my behalf for procreation, for the wealth of subjects (or: descendants), for the prosperity of the subjects, for the procreation of the subjects, for the kingship of king Soma, for my leadership of the clan"[24].

Grāva Maitreya said: "What shall I obtain by singing for the one and what for the other?"[25]. Thereby he meant to say then (that he uttered the formulas in the following form): "O Soma, sing as a chanter, as a chanter sing, O Soma, (i.e. obtain by singing) this or that for such and so". All these wishes become fulfilled for him. When the Dhiṣṇya fires are disposed, these are extended as divine (i.e. symbolic or magic) snares. He who not[26] knowing them enters upon (the Mahāvedi), gets entangled in them. The room between the Āgnīdhra and the Cātvāla is the door of the sacrifice. Through this he enters upon (the Mahāvedi)[27], through this (same) he goes out (for the Bahiṣpavamāna). The Vedi is Dhā by name. Entering upon (it) he should say: "You are the holder (*dhā*). Make welfare (*sudhā*) for me. May we sing here the Udgītha in good health and being vigorous[28]".

85. When they slowly move to the Out-of-doors laud after having drawn draughts (of Soma) inside the Havirdhāna, they thereby continue life[29] and move to heaven. They move in a continuous movement (i.e.

holding on to each other)—heaven forms a continuum[30] as it were (with the earth)[31]—for the sake of the continuity between heaven (and earth) and in order that heaven does not become separated. They move stooped forward[32]. Heaven is "upbank"[33] so to say from here. Just as someone who goes upwards against the bank is stooped forward, so it is. (This is done) in order to reach heaven and not to get into trouble on one's way[34].

The Adhvaryu, the breath of the sacrifice, moves first. If they should become separated from him, they would become separated from life; they would become destroyed. The Prastotṛ, the head of the Sāman, moves second. If they should become separated from him, they would suffer a capital injury. The Udgātṛ, who is associated with all the gods and who is to be identified with Prajāpati, moves third. If they should become separated from him, they would suffer the complete loss of all their property. The Pratihartṛ moves fourth, since he is connected with one fourth of the Sāman. If they should become separated from him, they would have to pay for this with one fourth part of themselves. The sacrificer moves fifth. The sacrifice is fivefold[35], the domestic animals (or: the victims) are fivefold[35]. If they should become separated from him, they would become separated from sacrifice and cattle.

86. The Brahman priest moves sixth. There are six metres[36]. By means of the metres he thereby wards off evil in the form of the Rakṣas. Brahman is this all. In that the Brahman priest is at the rearward, thereby one wards off the Rakṣas with the Brahman and moves to heaven. They move (to the Out-of-doors laud) with a bunch of grass. The bunch of grass (*prastara*) is the sacrificer[37], the subjects are the sacrificial grass (of the Vedi, the Barhis). When they hold the grass (and shake it) over and over the Barhis, they thereby push the sacrificer on his subjects. Therefore the sacrificer is (placed) over the others, his subjects.

If he should throw down (the Prastara) on (the Vedi), the sacrificer would reach heaven and become separated from this world. If he should throw (it) beyond (the Vedi), he would be firmly established in this world and become separated from heaven.

As to this they say: "The wife is the half[38] of the sacrificer. In that she is outside the Vedi, thereby he does not become separated from this world. (So) he may throw it down (on the Vedi)[39]. After all it also happens that there is no wife. Moreover, even if there should be a wife, he should partly throw down upon (the Vedi) and partly beyond (it). In that he throws upon (it), thereby he (the sacrificer) will reach heaven, in that he throws beyond (it), thereby he does not become separated from this world.

I. 1. 2. 2. *The Out-of-doors laud* (87–89)

CH §134 d–h; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 459–469; II, 1 (S.S.), 278–291; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 413; 416–417; *Agni* I, 602–605; Caland, *Auswahl*, 17–19 (1, 87; 89); Ghosh, *Fragments*, 1 ff. (1, 88).

PB. 6, 7, 24; 6, 8; JUB. 1, 1–9; JŚS. 1, 11; LŚS. 1, 12; DŚS. 3, 4, 16–38.

87. In the beginning the sun was here on earth on the spot where the Cātvāla is situated here, the fire was in yonder world. The one (i.e. the sun) heated everything here. The gods were afraid of being burnt by the other[1]. They said: "This one here (i.e. the fire) will burn everything here (in heaven). Let us exchange the two"[2]. They took the one (the sun) from here with three (verses of the Bahiṣpavamāna); from the intermediate space with three; with three they made it go to heaven. Then it heated away (i.e. upwards). They saw this last syllable which contains the meaning hither[3]. Thereby they made it directed hither. Since then it gives heat here hither. With the same syllable containing the meaning hither (or: here) they placed the fire in this world. If he should wish that the sacrificer reaches heaven, he should chant after having made him look at the Cātvāla. He takes him away from here with three (verses), from the intermediate space with three and with three he makes him go to heaven. The sacrificer will reach heaven. However, he runs the risk of dying prematurely, for[4] they sing the laud on verses which are thitherward (i.e. without returning or repetition)[5]. As soon as[6] they have chanted the laud with all the verses he should first recite the last verse (the ninth) and then the preceding (or nearer, i.e. the eight) and then the preceding, (i.e.) all of them hither directed. As to this they also say: "By all means this is a coming down again, but he (the sacrificer) sacrifices with the wish to reach heaven". Because there is there (in the original thitherward chanting of the verses) a final syllable which contains the meaning hither, therefore he does not become separated from this world.

88. They chant the last (verse) provided with syllables of the Rathantara[7]. The Rathantara is this world[8].

Prajāpati created the creatures. Having been created they completely besieged him on all sides looking for food[9]. He created food for them by means of the Hiṃ-sound. By means of the Om-sound (the syllable Om) he prevented the created (food) from going away. The Udgātṛ is Prajāpati. The creatures looking for food completely besiege him here on all sides. For them he creates food by means of the Hiṃ-sound. If, after having made the Hiṃ-sound, he should not[10] pronounce (the syllable) Om, the food would go away[11]. If he should utter the Sāman first, power would go to the Kṣatriya class, for the Sāman is the Kṣatriya

class[12]. If he should utter the Ṛc first, power would go to the people, for the Ṛc is the people[13]. He[14] utters the Yajus formula first. The Yajus is the class of the Brahmins[15]. Thereby he produces spiritual lustre. (He says:) "*bhūr bhuvaḥ svar*. I shall make honey. I shall produce honey. There will be honey[16]. (Bring us)[17] prosperity, prosperity, refreshment, nourishment". That he says, "*bhūr, bhuvaḥ, svar*", that is the Brahman class, the Yajus. That he says "I shall make honey"—honey is offspring—thereby he makes offspring. That he says "I shall produce honey", thereby he produces (offspring). That he says "There will be honey", thereby he makes this (offspring) reach wealth[18]. That he says "Prosperity, prosperity"—prosperity is man's property[19], prosperity is his house, prosperity is his offspring, prosperity is cattle—thereby he obtains this. That he says "refreshment, nourishment"—rain serves for refreshment and what grows after the rain serves for nourishment—thereby he obtains this.

89. He should chant after having arranged Prajāpati[20]. He who chants after having arranged Prajāpati, to him he (P.) is favourable[21]. (He mutters:) "The quarters (*diśas*), the *pradiśas*, the *vidiśas*, the *uddiśas*, the *diśas*"[22]. Prajāpati is these quarters. Thus having arranged Prajāpati, he chants. He (P.) is favourable to him who knows thus.

Kapivana Bhauvāyana used to say: "Do they really come to (i.e. participate in) a sacrifice who take part in the *prasarpaṇa* (towards the Sadas) without drinking something of god[23] Soma or who (even) drive off on their chariot after the conclusion of the Out-of-doors laud?[24]". He should address that Brahmin among those present at the Bahiṣpavamāna whom he may regard to be pure with the words "Give me your hand"[25].

Having thereby invited (all of them) he should recite: "The Soma drink of the gods here at this sacrifice, on the sacred grass, on the Vedi, of this we eat"[26]. Whether one drives off or not, all the same god Soma has been consumed by him.

The animals of the forest live here (i.e. outside the Vedi, where the Out-of-doors laud is chanted). Because they chant the Out-of-doors laud in the forest, therefore the forest animals go to the forest. They chant the laud on verses which are thitherward. Therefore the forest animals are driven away from the one forest to the other. They chant the laud on verses of one form[27]. Therefore the forest animals are of one colour. The last syllable contains the meaning "hither". Therefore they find (once in a while) a single forest animal[28] in the village and they bring to the village one that has been killed in the forest.

After having chanted the laud they walk northwards[29]. Thereby they make the sacrifice go to heaven. They raise their arms. Thereby they

place the sacrificer in heaven. Thereby they do something which is against normal order in that they make a mortal go to immortality. They lose their beauty and lustre. If now someone else stands up one should hold on to him who stands up and follow in standing up. One does not lose beauty and lustre and does not suffer any injury.

He should know what will be the future. When these people[30] should be running away, then he may know: "My property will run away, for this Udgātṛ has sung in such a way". And if they should be calm so to say, then he may know: "My property will remain calm, for this Udgātṛ has sung in such a way". This is a means of knowing it.

I. 1. 2. 3. *The verses of the out-of-doors laud: various aims* (90–96)

PB. 6, 9, 10; KṣudraS. 1, 1, 1–3.

90. (The tristich beginning) "Sing, o men, a song on (*upa*) this (World)"[1] he should take as opening who desires to obtain a village[2], prosperity and offspring. On this earth, forsooth, they sing a song here. On (upon: *upa*)[3] this earth is everything here. On this earth he is productive in offspring and cattle who knows thus. Men are the divine clans, Soma is the nobility. Thereby he obtains the people and the nobility. (He sings) "which longs for the god"[4]. Thereby he honours all the gods without a break.

(The tristich beginning) "With the produced fluid, which crosses the waters (*aptur*) . . (the gods have come)"[5] he should take as opening who desires offspring. Offspring is something additional[6] to oneself. In addition to himself he reproduces himself with offspring and is productive in cattle. He should take the same opening who.[7]. For having reached (*āptvā*) one who is *aptur*[8] of this earth, i.e. one who is superior, he becomes more wealthy.

(He sings) "Bursting (forth) (,) with cows (,) adorned"[9]. Sacrifice is bursting with cows—for sacrifice is cattle—, adorned[10]. Thereby he obtains sacrifice and cattle. (He sings) "The gods have come to the drop of Soma". Soma is the sacrificer[11], the lauds are the gods. The laud makes him go to heaven.

91. (The tristich beginning) "Be clarified as the foremost of speech"[12] he should take as opening who desires the highest position. Prajāpati created the creatures. Having been created they did not respect him. He desired: "May I obtain the highest position among these creatures". He saw this opening. He sang the laud with it. Thereupon he obtained the highest position among these creatures. He who knows thus, obtains the highest position among his own men. Moreover a Stotra verse which begins with "Be clarified" is a fortunate verse. There is sung a laud by him with a fortunate Stotra verse.

He who knows a divine (i.e. symbolic) couple procreates with a (biological) couple. (The words) "Be clarified" and "of speech" are a divine couple. He who knows thus procreates with a (biological) couple.

This is the opening of all the three Sāmans: "be clarified" of the Vāmadevya, "of speech" of the Rathantara, "the foremost" of the Bṛhat. There is sung a laud by him with the opening of all Sāmans.

(He sings) "O Soma, with your wonderful refreshments". Soma is the wonderful among the gods. He becomes rich in[13] Soma, the wonderful among the gods, and he is productive in offspring.

(He sings) "In order to win all the powers of inspiration". Thereby he obtains every visionary power.

92. (The tristich beginning) "Be clarified, o juice, when you, the bull, have been pressed out"[14] he should take as opening who desires to obtain a firm footing among foreign people[15]. For on account of the words "Make us renowned among the people"[15] there arises renown for him among foreign people[15]. (He sings) "When you, the bull, have been pressed out". There is so to say a bull, a progenitor, a ruler in that community in which there is prosperity. He who knows thus appears as a bull, as a progenitor, as a ruler in that (foreign) community in which he lives.

Everybody is hostile against someone who strives to prosper among foreign people. (He sings) "Repel all hostilities". Thereby he repels all hostilities for himself.

(The tristich beginning) "Become clarified by this stream"[16] he should take as opening for someone[17] who wishes to begin a combat. (He sings) "by which the cows may come hither, the cows of an other people, towards our houses". He who wishes to begin a combat, wishes to take the cattle of an other people. He (actually) takes the cattle of foreign people.

He who wants to go after rewards[18], should take the same opening. He who goes for rewards, wants to take the cattle of an other people. He who knows thus takes the cattle of an other people and the cattle of an other people fall to his share.

(The tristich beginning) "Agni, you purify the lives"[19] he should take as opening for someone who is diseased. His body enters into the fire, his breath into the wind. By means of fire which purifies (or: blows)[20] he connects body and breath (soul). The same opening they should take, if someone among those who have been consecrated, dies[21]. Those are so to say regarded as unclean and impure among whom somebody dies after they have become consecrated. He makes them clean and pure with the fire which purifies.

The same opening he should take—

93. —who desires spiritual lustre. Agni is the Brahmin among the

gods. By means of Agni, the Brahmin among the gods, he obtains spiritual lustre.

The same opening he should take who bewitches. Agni is the Brahmin among the gods. By means of Agni, the Brahmin among gods, he lays low the one whom he hates.

The same opening he should take who longs for food. For by singing "Assign us strength and freshness" he obtains freshness and strength on this earth.

The same opening he should take who becomes bewitched. For he who bewitches, treats someone as an enemy or wishes to do wrong, is a mischievous demon. Singing "Ward off the evil demon far away" he thereby wards off far away the hating evil rival and keeps him down.

(The tristich beginning) "By fiercely shining lustre"[22] he should take as opening who desires spiritual lustre. The Gāyatrī is fiercely shining[23]. The Gāyatrī is spiritual lustre[24], the Triṣṭubh is energy and force[25], the Jagatī is procreation. Possessing spiritual lustre, energy and force[26] he becomes productive[27] with offspring and cattle who knows thus. (He sings) "With loudly sounding splendour the Soma (draughts) are bright and mixed with milk". The bright Soma (draughts) are the sacrifice, mixed with milk are the cows. Thereby he obtains the sacrifice and cows.

(The tristich beginning) "In accordance with his traditional splendour"[28] he should take as opening whose father or grandfather may be more important than himself and who considers himself to be lower. He obtains the lustre belonging to his father and grandfather.

(He sings) "The shameless have milked the brilliant (milk)". The brilliant (milk) is the sacrifice, the shameless are the cows. Thereby he obtains the sacrifice and cows.

(He sings) "The milk from the Ṛṣi who grants a thousand". He becomes possessing milk and a strong son who grants a thousand, is born to him.

94. (The tristich beginning) "These drops (of Soma) have become poured out"[29] he should take as opening for many sacrificers who sacrifice together[30]. By the word "these" he addresses them with a view to pre-eminence and superiority[31]. He makes them having an equal share by means of a verse which is characterized by this (equality on account of the plural "these"). An equal blessing of the sacrifice falls to their share.

When Prajāpati created the creatures, he created them by means of this opening. (Saying) "these" he created the gods, (saying) "have become poured out" the human beings, (saying) "drops" the Pitṛs, (with) "through the strainer" the draughts (of Soma) (with) "the

coursers" the lauds, (with) "all" the Ukthas, (with) "towards the riches" he decorated them with fortune, after they had been created. He who knowing thus sings with this opening, becomes Prajāpati and creates creatures. And he decorates them with fortune, after they have been created.

(The tristich beginning) "The price-winning ones were let loose"[32] he should take as opening for three sacrificers who sacrifice together. He makes them having an equal share by means of a verse which is characterized by this (equality on account of the plural which denotes the winners). An equal blessing of the sacrifice falls to their share. (He sings) "The Soma (juices), longing for cows and horses". Thereby he obtains cows and horses for them. (He sings) "The brilliant coursers, for the sake of the hero". Brilliant is the sacrifice, a hero is offspring. Thereby he obtains for them the sacrifice and offspring.

(The tristich beginning) "Both of you are lords of the celestial light"[33] he should take as opening for two sacrificers who sacrifice together. By means of a verse which is characteristic he makes them having an equal share. An equal blessing of the sacrifice falls to their share.

95. (He sings) "Two lords of cattle, as rulers cause our thoughts to overflow". Indra and Soma desired: "May we obtain sovereignty and supremacy over all the creatures". They both together saw this opening. They sang the laud with it. Thereupon they both reached sovereignty and supremacy over all the creatures. He who has praised with this opening reaches sovereignty and supremacy over his own men.

(The tristich beginning) "For Indra, accompanied with the Maruts, o juice"[34] he should take as opening for a noble man. The noble man belongs to Indra, the clans to the Maruts. Thereby they make the people following the class of the noble men. Therefore the people obeys the class of the noble men.

Or (he sings as opening) "Who overpowers and does not become overpowered himself"[35]. He overpowers and does not become overpowered himself. (He sings) "Who kills the enemy when he attacks". In an attack in which only one of the two parties comes off worst[36], he kills the enemy. The enemy is not able to make a stand. (He sings) "Become clarified, o conqueror of thousands". He who conquers everyone, is victorious. He who has praised with this opening, becomes victorious.

96. (The tristich beginning) "He becomes purified, warding off the despisers"[37] he should take as opening for someone who becomes calumniated. Unpleasant despisers form the company of him whom they calumniate. He wards off the wicked despisers. (He sings) "He, Soma, (warding) off the envious". For the envious form the company of him whom they calumniate. (He sings) "going to the place of rendezvous of

Indra". He whom they calumniate is without power (*anindriya*) and without senses (*adeva*). Hereby they make him powerful (*indriyavat*) and in the full possession of his mental faculties (*sadeva*)[38].

He should take an opening which is connected with Agni and Varuṇa[39] for someone who is diseased and suffering from a lingering disease. He who is diseased and suffering from a lingering disease is seized by Agni and Varuṇa. By Agni he frees him from Agni's fetters, by Varuṇa from Varuṇa's.

A verse consisting of shorter pādas in which one pāda is longer, or consisting of longer pādas in which one pāda is shorter, he should take as opening who desires to use small bait-fish in order to catch the big fishes[40]. Thinking "The bigger longs for[41] the smaller" he tries to get the bigger by means of the (bait consisting of the) smaller[42]. He who knows thus, obtains the bigger by means of the smaller.

(The tristich beginning) "This immortal god"[43] he should take as opening whoever desires "May I become at once the chief among my own people, may I reach glory". (Singing) "this (one)"[44] he addresses him[45] with a view to pre-eminence and superiority. At once he becomes the chief among his own people and reaches glory. There is, however, a chance that in his offspring there will not be born[46] someone else who is such a hero. For the language (of the verse) addresses him saying as it were "this one, not someone else". This is, however, not thus. He says "immortal god". He is not a god and he is mortal to whom, being a hero, there is not born a strong hero. And he is a god, he is immortal, to whom, being a hero, there is born a strong hero. To him being a hero there is born a strong hero. He forms a continuity with his offspring and there is not a break between him and his offspring.

I. 1. 2. 4. *The out-of-doors laud: the modifications at the singing of the Gāyatrī verses called Dhūrs, their mythical origin and explanation* (97–104)

Caland, *Auswahl*, 19 ff. (1, 97–99); O'Flaherty, *Sex and Violence*. Chicago 1985, 51–52; Fujii, *Machikaneyama Ronso*, Osaka 1986, 22, n. 19.
JB. 1, 259–273; 315–321; ṢaḍvB. 2, 1–3; LŚS. 7, 12, 1–7; 7, 13, 13.

97. The gods and the Asuras were at strife[1]. The gods created a razor-edged Vajra[2]: man. They hurled him at the Asuras. Having dispersed[3] the Asuras he came back[4] and turned against the gods[5]. The gods became afraid of him. Having taken hold of him they broke him into three pieces[6]. Having been broken into three pieces he nevertheless resurrected. They took hold of him and inspected him. Then they saw that divine powers, i.e. the metres[7], had entered into man. They said: "These divine powers, the metres, have entered into this man. Having

lived a meritorious life in this world with[8] sacrificing and liberality[9], asceticism and good deeds he will follow us (and reach heaven)". They said: "Let us act so that he does not follow us". "Let us equip him with evil". They equipped him with the following evil:[10]

98. sleep, lassitude[11], anger, hunger, passion for gambling, passion for women[12]. These evils are associated with man in this world. (Saying) "If someone will overcome this and will try to do some good in this world, o Agni, than you shall try to destroy it in this world" they placed Agni (fire) in this world, Vāyu in the intermediate space and Āditya in heaven.

[13]Ugradeva Rājani used to say: "It is not me who has hostile intentions against man, but the three highest gods, whom I hear to be hostile[14]. For hostility is every time shown to him against whom these gods have hostile intentions". "And the gods do not behave in a hostile way against him who knows thus and they want to injure him who wishes to injure someone who knows thus."[15]

The gods said: "Let us cause to fall (*dhūrvāma*)[16] the Asuras with those very divine powers, the metres, which have entered into man".

99. Through the Gāyatrī they snatched away their breath,[17] through the Triṣṭubh their sight, through the Jagatī their hearing, through the Anuṣṭubh their speech. They caused them to disappear from this world through the Gāyatrī, from the intermediate space through the Triṣṭubh, from heaven through the Jagatī, from the cattle[18] through the Anuṣṭubh. They caused them to disappear from the whole universe. Then the gods got the upper hand and the Asuras were lost. He who knows thus gets the upper hand and his hateful rival is lost.

Because the gods caused the Asuras to fall (*adhūrvan*) therefore the Dhūrs[19] are called Dhūrs (*tad dhurām dhūstvam*). He who knows thus causes his hateful rival to fall.

When Prajāpati created the creatures he created them with the Dhūrs. He poured out seed (*retas*) with the Retasyā verse[20], he produced breath with the Gāyatrī, sight with the Triṣṭubh, hearing with the Jagatī and speech with the Anuṣṭubh. With the Paṅkti[21] he added the trunk (*ātman*) to it. Having become Prajāpati he creates creatures (or: offspring) who knowing thus sings with the Dhūrs.

100. He sings the Retasyā verse. Thereby he emits seed. He sings without interruption. Seed is non-interruption (of the lineage)[22]. He sings the first two verses in a secret way[23]. Seed is something secret. He does not 'touch' the verse on which the Sāman is based (i.e. he sings in a very free way, so that the verse is hardly recognizable)[24]. If he should touch the verse, he would cut off his seed[25] (i.e. make him childless).

He sings the verse with three 'raisings'[26]. By means of the first raising he acquires the exhalation, with the second the inhalation, with the third

the respiration (*vyāna*)[27]. He sings the verse with three raisings. He acquires himself with the first raising, his wife with the second, his offspring with the third. He sings the verse with three raisings. He mounts this world with the first raising, the intermediate space with the second, heaven with the third. He who knowing thus sings the verse with three raisings becomes victorious with regard to the world of the rival[28].

He who wishes to annihilate the world of the rival should sing the verse with two raisings. Soon[29] his hating rival becomes lost and he obtains glory himself. However, he runs the risk of dying prematurely. For he parts with the (life) breaths[30], (when he parts with) the verse of three protractions. He should try to do so that he obtains a complete life (time). He should try to annihilate the world of the rival by other means. He should indeed sing the verse with three raisings. He should not utter the sound Hiṃ. If he should utter the sound Hiṃ, which is a thunderbolt, he would split the seed[31].

101. As to this they say: "With the sound Hiṃ Prajāpati created food for the creatures. If he were not to utter the sound Hiṃ, the creatures would become hungry. He should utter the sound Hiṃ (singing) *abhāyi dāyivaṃ o yā hiṃ kṣate bhūr*[32]. In that he does not utter the Hiṃ sound with a following Visarga *ā*[33], he does not[34] split the seed and he does not become excluded from the sound Hiṃ". Now they also say as to this: "On account of this (leaving out of *ā* behind the Hiṃkāra) the seed becomes weaker[35] and the Hiṃ-sound harder[36]. Or one could no doubt[37] split this (seed) with a hair[38]. He should think the Hiṃ-sound mentally[39] at the moment when normally it has to be pronounced. Thereby he does not split the seed and he does not become excluded from the Hiṃ-sound". He makes *bhūḥ* the Nidhana[40]. When in the beginning Prajāpati spoke, he spoke: *bhūḥ*. (Thereby) he created this earth. In that he makes *bhūḥ* the Nidhana (finale), thereby he firmly places this seed in the earth and thereby he also makes it go to development (*bhūti*).

102. [41]He sings the Gāyatrī. The Gāyatrī is breath[42]. He intertwines two of its syllables[43]. Thereby he intertwines exhalation and inhalation. Therefore exhalation and inhalation mutually intertwined go to and fro among the creatures with unweakened strength. He makes *sat*[44] the Nidhana. *sat* is the breath[45]. Thereby he obtains a firm support in breath.

He sings the Triṣṭubh. The Triṣṭubh is sight. He makes two of its syllables manifest[46]. Thereby he places the two eyes. Therefore the two eyes are yoked as it were as a couple[47]. He makes *jyotis*[48] the Nidhana.

He sings the Jagatī. The Jagatī is hearing. He makes four of its syllables manifest. Thereby he places the hearing: two cavities of the ear

and two shells of the ear[49]. Therefore, remaining on one and the same place, one hears (the sounds of) all the respective quarters of space. Even going away one hears people speak behind[50] (oneself). He makes *iḷā* the Nidhana. The *iḍā* ("holy libation") is cattle[51]. Thereby he obtains a firm support in cattle.

He sings the Anuṣṭubh. The Anuṣṭubh is speech. He sings pushing against it so that it turns in this direction[52] in order that speech may not run away. If he should sing pushing it away so that in turns away, he would blow away speech. Speech would run away from him. When he sings pushing against it so that it turns in this direction he thereby places speech in himself.

He sings two of its Pādas expressed (*nirukta*) and unexpressed (*anirukta*). They eat with the expressed part of speech; its unexpressed part is something to live on[53]. He who knows thus eats with *vāc* and lives on it[54]. If he should sing it expressedly, the creatures would talk and not remain silent. And if he should sing unexpressedly, the creatures would remain silent and would not talk. Because he sings two Pādas expressedly and unexpressedly, people talk and remain silent. He makes *vāc* the Nidhana, Brahman is speech (*vāc*). Thereby he obtains a firm support in speech, i.e. in Brahman.

He sings the Paṅkti. The Paṅkti is the seasons. He makes six of its syllables manifest. There are six seasons[55]. Thereby he obtains a firm support in the seasons.

103. Now they say: "They produce a strife for the metres when they use all the metres in singing, whereas the morning pressing belongs to the Gāyatrī. People become quarrelsome". If he should wish: "May the subjects thrive in peace", he should not sing the Dhūrs with various metres[56]. (However, by leaving out the Dhūrs) he would make the sacrifice without a head[57] and he would unjustly receive Dakṣiṇās. The sacrificer gives the Dakṣiṇās thinking: "Let him make Brahman"[58]. He should try to act so that he does not make the sacrificer's sacrifice headless and that he does not unjustly receive Dakṣiṇās. He should indeed sing on different metres. However, if wishing to pick out a particular metre out of another (i.e. out of the Gāyatrī) he does not succeed in doing so, then he gets into trouble. If[59] he is not able to discern the Retasyā while singing (the Gāyatrī), he becomes without seed himself and seedless children are born to him. If he is not able to discern the Gāyatrī in his song, he becomes liable to destruction himself and his children are born dead. If he is not able to discern the Triṣṭubh while singing, he becomes blind himself and his children are born blind. If he is not able to discern the Jagatī while singing, he becomes deaf himself and his children are born deaf. If he is not able to discern the Anuṣṭubh while singing, he becomes tongueless (mute) and his children

are born mute. If he is not able to discern the Paṅkti while singing, the seasons become disturbed. If he should not expect to be able to discern them in his song he should sing them in a mystic way. In both ways the Retasyā is sung[60].

[61]104. Singing the Gāyatra he should fix his mind[62] on the earth after the Gāyatrī has been chanted. He should breathe in and out[63]. He makes *sat* the finale. Thereby he sings it[64] in a mystic way.

Singing the Gāyatra he should fix his mind on the intermediate space after the Triṣṭubh has been chanted[65]. He should try to look with his eyes. He makes *jyotis* the finale. Thereby he sings it in a mystic way.

Singing the Gāyatra he should fix his mind on the quarters and cattle after the Jagatī has been chanted. He should try to listen with his ears. He makes *iḷā* the finale. Thereby he sings it in a mystic way.

Singing the Gāyatra he should fix his mind on heaven after the Anuṣṭubh has been chanted. Singing with his voice he makes *vāc* the finale. Thereby he sings it in a mystic way.

Singing the Gāyatra he should fix his mind on the seasons, after the Paṅkti has been chanted. Thereby he sings it in a mystic way.

Here he sings the last strophe of three verses quickly. This strophe is procreative. Quickly he reproduces himself with offspring and is productive with cattle who knows thus. When Prajāpati created the creatures he created them with this very strophe. Saying *pavamānasya te kave vājin sargā asṛkṣata*[66] he created with every *sarga* (creation or form of the root *sṛj*) which occurred in the verse. And he also created with *asṛgraṃ vāre avyaye*[67]. He became afraid that after having been created they would become scattered away. With this verse: *acchā samudram indavaḥ*[68] he surrounded (them) on all sides with the ocean. They did not become scattered away. (He sings) *agmann ṛtasya yonim ā*[69]. The safe place of order (*ṛtasya yoni*) is the house.[70] On the strength of[71] this syllable (*ā*) people who have been born here go away and come back (*ā*) here (i.e. in the house).

I. 1. 3. *The Ājya-lauds* (105–110)

CH, 236–238; 243–244; 247–248; 261–262; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 591–594; 600; 607; 613; (S.S.) 328–332; 336–337; 340–342; 345–347; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 417–419; *Agni* I, 626–632; Caland, *Auswahl*, 21–25 (1, 105–109).

JB. 1, 253; 312; 318–319; PB. 6, 8, 12–16; 7, 2; JŚS. 1, 15; LŚS. 2, 5, 18–21; 2, 6, 4–12; DŚS. 5, 1, 23–27; 5, 2, 9–19.

105. The gods and the Asuras contended for these worlds, for this universe. The gods desired: "May we win[1] these worlds and gain the victory over the hostile Asuras"[2]. They conceived these Ājya lauds. They used them as lauds. By means of them they won these worlds.

They won this world with the laud relating to Agni, the intermediate space with the laud relating to Mitra and Varuṇa, yonder world (heaven) with the laud relating to Indra and the quarters of space with the laud relating to Indra and Agni. Because they won (*ājayan*), therefore the Ājya lauds are called the Ājyas. He who knows thus wins these worlds and gains victory over his hating rival.

The gods said: "Let us divide these (lauds)". They did not agree on the distribution. They said: "Let us compete in a chariot-race for them and make the mountain[3] the turning-post". Because they said "Let us compete in a chariot race for them" (*ājim eṣām ayāma*), therefore there is a second explanation of the name Ājya. Moreover, because they made the mountain the turning-post, therefore that (mythical) mountain is called a stick (*kāṣṭha*)[3].

106. When they started, the forces seemed to be equally distributed[4]. Agni was the first of them to win a race, then Mitra and Varuṇa and thereupon Indra. There was still one race to win. Then Indra realized: "Agni will win this". He said: "If[5] one of the two of us will win, then it must be shared by us". "All right". Then Agni won. It was shared by them (so that) the one had one and a half Stotra and the other one and a half. Sacrifice is sacred to Indra and Agni[6]. He who thus knows these victories of the gods, becomes victorious in case he wishes: "May I become victorious".

As to this they say: "If all the Ājya Stotras have the same finales, whereby is variation (or: non-incest) (*ajāmi*)[7] produced[8]. "They have different deities" one should say; "thereby inbreeding is avoided". And also he should say: "Because they have different forms, thereby too".

These (Ājyas) are animals. Because they sing these Ājya lauds inside the Sadas, therefore the domesticated animals have their abodes inside the village[9]. (They sing) on verses which are thitherward (i.e. without repetition) and (thereupon) constantly returning (i.e. repeating)[10]. Therefore the domesticated animals go out (for food)[11] in the morning and return in the evening[12]. They sing the laud on verses which have different forms. Therefore the domesticated animals have different forms (or: colours)[13]. They sing the laud on verses which have different deities. Therefore the domesticated animals go separately each to their own houses[14] at night.

107. The gods and the Asuras were fighting a long time without reaching a final victory. All here belonged to the Asuras and with the gods was only one syllable (*akṣara*): speech (*vāc*) (or: one thing which is imperishable: speech). Agni said: "I have conceived this (namely) how I shall win this (or: here)". They said: "Say it". He said: "Having engaged this all in battle[15] with the Akṣara we must attack[16] in single combats with pole to pole[17] (*dhurādhuram*)". Because he said: "Having

engaged this all in battle with the Akṣara we must attack in single combats with pole to pole", therefore the Ājyadhūrs are called Ājyadhūrs[18]. Having engaged this all in battle with the Akṣara they attacked in single combats with pole to pole. They gained the victory over them. He who knows thus gains the victory over his hating rival.

If he should sing the other Dhūrs (i.e. those of the Bahiṣpavamāna) on different metres, he also has to sing the Ājya Dhūrs on different metres. He who knowing thus should say: "I engage you in battle with the Imperishable (*akṣara*)" to the inimical clan in case two clans have become engaged in battle, gains the victory over this clan.

[19]The gods said: "Let us divide these (lauds)". They did not agree on the distribution. They said: "Let us compete in a chariot-race for them [and make the mountain the turning-post". Because they said: "Let us compete in a chariot race for them" (*ājim eṣām ayāma*), therefore there is a second explanation of the name Ājya. Moreover, because they made the mountain the turning-post, therefore also the mountain is called a stick (*kāṣṭha*)][19].

108. They (ran this race) for these (Ājya lauds) (and) started once for all of them (i.e. they contended for all the four Ājya lauds in one race[20]). Agni was in the lead among them. Then his axle broke just before he had reached the finish[21]. The wheel of his chariot fell off . . . but kept turning round (?)[22]. Having seen this they said of him: "He will become the most respected to whom others have to give their tribute, for his evil took a favourable turn". He who knowing thus turns over (i.e. overthrows the power of a king or authority?), becomes the most respected among his own people and the one who receives their tributes. Moreover they make his misfortune turn into fortune.

Agni having won drove off. Then Indra said to him: "It should be shared by both of us". He (A.) said: "No". (I. said:) "What one of the inmates of a common house obtains, that belongs to all of them together[23]. It should be shared by both of us". He (A.) said: "No". Then he (I.) said: "Look at me". He looked at him. He said: "You have looked at me in order to make up our dispute. Now it has become shared by both of us". "I will share indeed (and signify my choice by throwing a look)" he (A.)[24] said, "but only with those people, at whom I myself wish to look on every occasion". "No" he (I.) said; "you have looked at me on this occasion[25] (and you did so) in order to make up our dispute. It must be shared by both of us".

109. The two (said): "Let us refer it to arbitrage". They put their case (or: this question) before Prajāpati[26]. Prajāpati said: "It was indeed in order to make it up that you[27] did look at him. It has become shared by both of you". "All right". Then it was shared by both of them. One and a half Stotra was for the one and one and a half for the other[28].

Mitra and Varuṇa, who in fact are inbreathing and outbreathing, left the animals, because they felt slighted[29] (thinking:) "if we are neglected, then the animals will not breathe (anymore)". The animals were lying down, not breathing, but puffing and blowing. Then they told these two (i.e. Indra and Agni): "Mitra and Varuṇa, inbreathing and outbreathing, have left[30] the animals. They lie down, not breathing, but puffing and blowing. They both came running on and said: "Our animals must breathe by means of both of you". "Not with both of us as long as we are neglected" they said. Then they arranged it[31] for these two that there was also an Ājya (Stotra) destined for Mitra and Varuṇa. Thereupon the animals breathed through these two. He who knows this victory of Agni, becomes victorious, if he desires "May I win here". And he who knows this obtaining of one half by Indra, obtains one half, if he wishes "May I obtain one half". And he who knows this accommodation[31] of Mitra and Varuṇa (by Indra and Agni who arranged one Ājya Stotra for them), for him everything becomes favourable[31], if he wishes "May it become favourable for me here".

110. These Ājya (lauds) are all connected with Indra and Agni. They chant the (first) laud on verses belonging to Agni. Thereby it is connected with Agni. The metre is a Gāyatrī. Thereby it is connected with Agni[32]. The Stoma is the fifteenfold. Thereby it is connected with Indra[33].

They sing this (Ājya) laud which is connected with Indra and Agni (the third time) on verses which belong to Indra. Thereby it is connected with Indra. The metre is Gāyatrī[34]. Thereby it is connected with Agni. The Stoma is the Fifteenfold. Thereby it is connected with Indra.

They sing this (Ājya) laud which is connected with Indra and Agni (the fourth time) on verses which belong to Indra and Agni. Thereby it is connected with Indra and Agni. The metre is a Gāyatrī. Thereby it is connected with Agni. The Stoma is the Fifteenfold. Thereby it is connected with Indra.

Therefore this (fourfold Ājya Stotra) is connected with Indra and Agni. Indra and Agni together form the deity of sacrifice. Thereby he gives sacrifice a firm foothold in its own deity at the morning libation of Soma.

I. 1. 4. *The Gāyatra Sāman chanted in the Out-of-doors laud.* (1, 111–115)

PB. 7. 1; DŚS. 3, 4, 12–15

111[1]. Prajāpati produced the creatures. He produced them without breath. By means of this (Gāyatra) Sāman he made breath for them. The Gāyatra is breath[2]. He who knows thus reaches a complete lifetime.

After they had obtained breath the Rakṣas demons persecuted them. Singing this Sāman he rescued them. Because singing (*gāyan*) he rescued (*atrāyata*) therefore the Gāyatra is called Gāyatra. He who knows thus rescues himself from all evil[3]. It should be chanted in a rising tone[4]—Heaven is high—in order to reach heaven. It should be chanted in three sections[5]—there are three worlds here—in order to obtain these three worlds. It should be chanted with three 'raisings'[6]—there are three breaths: *prāṇa, apāna, vyāna*—for the sake of the continuity of these[7]. For him who knows thus exhalation, inhalation and circulation within the body (*prāṇa, apāna, vyāna*) form a continuous process. It should be chanted in three sections—there are three worlds here—in order that these worlds are continuous (and not separated from each other)[8]. For him who knows thus these three worlds form a continuity[9].

112. They say: "Something which is sacred to the Pitṛs is not to be undertaken[10] by him". Now this is sacred to the Pitṛs for him, namely that he makes his breath stop[11]. If he might prematurely become deprived of breath[12], he has to take breath[13] in the middle of the verse. The verse is breath, the Gāyatra is breath. Thereby he infuses[14] breath in the middle of breath.

If, however, he should actually become deprived (of breath before the end of the Gāyatrī)[15], he must chant the words *prāṇa*, *apāṇa* and *vyāna*. The word *prāṇa* is two syllables, *apāna* is three and *vyāna* is three. That amounts to eight. The Gāyatrī is eight-syllabic. Thereby he does not become deprived of the Gāyatrī.

There should not be retired to the forest[16] in the middle of a Sāman. He who retires to the forest in the middle of the Sāman, either loses all his property or dies. That one begins[17] after the opening (Prastāva) without a special tone (*svara*), that is the 'forest' (retirement into the forest; retirement from something undertaken) in the middle of a Sāman.

He should chant (the Sāman) after having provided (it) with a Svara[18]. The Svara is the own property[19] of the Sāman. Thereby he makes it prosper with its own property. The Svaras are the food of the Sāman. Thereby he makes it prosper with food. The Svara is the base[20] of the Sāman. Thereby he makes it prosper with a base. The Svara is the own speciality[21] of the Sāman. Thereby he makes it prosper with its own speciality.

113. The oblation of the sacrifice did not reach the gods. Prajāpati considered: "How might the oblation of the sacrifice now reach the gods?" He cut these two syllables out of the Gāyatrī: it was the twosyllabic exclamation Vaṣaṭ. Since then the oblation of the sacrifice reached the gods. The exclamation Vaṣaṭ is food. He who knows thus eats food.

Indra raised his Vajra against Vṛtra. These two syllables of this (word *vaṣaṭ*) were two disks[22]. This (word)[23] was a Vajra. He who should fondle these two, would fondle a Vajra.

He who milks something which has already been milked[24] does not thrive; but he who milks something which has not (yet) been milked thrives. He milks something which has already been milked[25] who uses these two syllables. Therefore these two should not be used. For him by whom the whole (*sarva*) Gāyatrī is chanted, everything (*sarva*) is obtained in his house. He by whom it is not chanted runs the risk of becoming emaciated. He should take away one of the two syllables (of the Vaṣaṭkāra)[26] and use[27] a twenty-fourfold speech[28]. There is not chanted a defective Gāyatrī by him and he also does not fondle (a Vajra).

114. He who knows the monosyllabic *aṃśu (graha)*[29] becomes an 'eater of food'[30] and the most respected among his people. And he also functions as an Udgātṛ for his people. Speech (*vāc*) is the monosyllabic *aṃśu (graha)*. It is the Gāyatra Sāman. In the Gāyatra which is chanted the last syllable of its introduction (*ādi*)[31] is a stumbling-block[32]. He who singing the Sāman touches upon this (syllable) touches upon a stumbling-block. He who leaves it out produces a gap in the Gāyatrī. When the Gāyatrī has become leaky as a result of this the sacrifice streams away, and consequent upon the sacrifice the sacrificer[33] and consequent upon[34] the sacrificer his subjects.

Sadhryaśva Taigmāyudhi said: "Who wishes now to foster two poisonous snakes (?)[35] in one's bosom?". The two final syllables of the Gāyatrī are two posisonous snakes. He who singing the Sāman touches upon these two fosters two poisonous snakes in his bosom. Who, on the other hand, leaves them out produces a gap in the Gāyatrī. When the Gāyatrī has become leaky as a result of this the sacrifice streams away, and consequent upon the sacrifice the sacrificer and consequent upon the sacrificer his subjects.

115. Leaving all these syllables out he should apply the word *vāc* (at the end). Speech (*vāc*) is Brahman. As one might pass thorny tracks[36] by covering them with a hide, in the same way he safely passes the stumbling-block of the sacrifice by crushing it down with *vāc*, i.e. with Brahman, and he does not suffer any injury. The Pratihartṛ becomes cut off from the Sāman, if he does not sing the Pratihāra of the Gāyatra. In thought he should make the Hiṃ-sound during the Prastāva. Having breathed in he should say: *vāc*. Thus he does not become cut off from the Sāman and he does not suffer any injury. Him who knows the syllable which is radiant, yoked horses which are radiant, convey. This syllable is (the word) speech (*vāc*). Its radiance is breath. Him who knows thus yoked horses which are radiant convey.

I. 2. *The midday service* (1, 116–155)

CH, 267–328; *Śrautakośa* II, 2, (E.S.), 619–710; II, 1 (S.S.), 350–415; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 419–425; *Agni* I, 632–646.
JB. 1, 322–355; PB. 7, 3–10; 8, 1–4; JŚS. 1, 16–17; LŚS. 2, 7–2, 10, 3; DŚS.5, 3–6, 2, 3.

I. 2. 1. *The Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna laud* (116–127)

CH, 277–282; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 634–637; II, 1 (S.S.), 357–365; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 419–422; *Agni* I, 633–639.
JB. 1, 322–326; PB. 7, 3–5; JŚS. 1, 16–17.

I. 2. 1. 1. *Opening. The Gāyatra* (116)

CH 276; 279–280; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 355–358; 361; 363; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 419–420; *Agni* I, 633.

116. The opening verses (of the Marutvatīyagrahaṇa)[1] contain references to the Maruts. They take a ladleful connected with the Maruts—Indra slew Vṛtra accompanied by the Maruts—for the sake of Vṛtra's slaying[2]. (The opening verses of the Gāyatra and Āmahīyava:) "In the highest it was produced by you, the plant"[3] contain the word 'plant' (*andhas*). The plant is the day[4]. It is the laying hold (or: beginning) of the day[5]. The (Soma) plant is the sacrifice. It is the laying hold of the sacrifice. The ancient Brahmins used to consider: "There are three plants in the sacrifice: *uccā te jātam andhasā*, *vasor mandānam andhasaḥ* and *purojitī vo andhasaḥ*[6]. Among the animals there are three moments for eating: at day-break, at noon and in the evening. These he thereby obtains.

[7]These worlds were together, but became separated. Nothing of them was falling together. Men and gods became hungry. For the gods live on what is given from here and men on what is given from yonder world[7]. Then Prajāpati saw these verses[8]: [9]"In the highest it was produced by you, the plant". 'Upwards' he conveyed the oblation from here to the gods. With (the second pāda) "I take (the Soma) which is in heaven to earth" he made the rain flow down from heaven. He made the two worlds associated. The two worlds had abundance (of food) agreeably to his wish. For him who knows thus these two worlds have abundance (of food) agreeably to his wish[9]. On these (verses) the Gāyatra is (chanted) of which the Brāhmaṇa has been treated[10].

I. 2. 1. 2. *The Āmahīyava* (117–118)

CH, 280; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 358; 361; 363–364; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 420; *Agni* I, 633; *Auswahl*, 26–28.
JB. 1, 322; PB. 7, 5, 1–5.

117. And now the Āmahīyava (Sāman). Prajāpati produced the creatures. He produced them without food[1]. Being hungry they ate each other. Prajāpati considered: "How might these creatures not be hungry?" He saw this Sāman. Thereby he gave them food, i.e., rain, but (he did so) with a Sāman without finale. It rained for them and it did not stop. Then he saw this finale. He used this. Then it stopped for them. On the strength[2] of this Sāman Parjanya rains and stops (raining).

Whoever desires rain, should chant the laud with this (Sāman) without finale. Parjanya is raining for him. If he rains too much, then he should apply this finale. Then he stops (raining) for him. Parjanya rains and stops (raining) for him who knows thus.

Because the creatures who were thorouhgly satiated and had eaten well, honoured (*āmahīyanta*) him, therefore the Āmahīyava is called Āmahīyava. Him who knows thus the thoroughly satiated dependents honour, while he himself is also thoroughly satiated[3].

Having obtained food they did not respect him (anymore). They were so to say companions[4]. For food is power. He became sad and was not happy. He considered: "How does it come about that I produce these creatures and that after having been produced they do not respect me?" He saw this Sāman. Herewith he chanted the laud.

118. He applied *stauṣe*[5] ("I praise") as finale and he gratified them. They fell into his power. He gratifies his hating rivals and they fall into his power, if he knows thus. Because he saw them being happy (*āmahīyamānāḥ*), therefore the Āmahīyava Sāman is called Āmahīyava. And also because having got them into his power he was happy (*āmahīyata*), it is called Āmahīyava. Having got his own people into his power he becomes happy[6] who knows thus. So if his people get out of his power as it were, he should sit down among them and study this (Sāman). He gets them into his power.

The Uttarakurus say: "The Pañcālas consume Soma for which the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation has not been uttered". (One might answer:)[7] "The Hotṛ utters the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation for every single deity, the Udgātṛ for all of them, for the Udgātṛ is sacred to all the gods. He should utter the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation with the finale of the Āmahīyava Sāman". By doing so (*iti*)[7] they consume Soma for which the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation has been uttered. As to this Mārja Śailāna observed: "He (already) gratifies the rivals with the finale". (Therefore) he should utter the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation

before the finale, singing: *vauṣaḍ bhūmī o dadā*[8]. He consumes Soma for which the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation has been uttered.

I. 2. 1. 3. *Metres* (119–120)

Auswahl, 28–29
PB. 7, 4

119. He who knows the udder of the sacrifice milks the sacrifice. The Pavamāna Stotra is sacrifice. Its udder is the Gāyatrī metre[1]. He should make the Gāyatrī consisting of four verses[2]. Thereby he makes an udder for the sacrifice and he milks the sacrifice. He who knows the support of the sacrifice, makes a support for the sacrifice and has a firm support himself.

The Pavamāna Stotra is sacrifice[3]. Its support is the Gāyatrī. He should make the Gāyatrī consisting of four verses. Thereby he makes a support (of four legs) for the sacrifice. He makes the sacrifice have a support and obtains a support himself.

He should make the Gāyatra Sāman based on these (Gāyatrī) verses: *ucca te jātam andhasā*, *asya pratnām anu dyutam* and *enā viśvāny arya ā*[4]. On these same the Āmahīyava. In that he produces an additional verse as fourth verse, thereby (the Sāman) becomes consisting of four verses. The royal court[5] becomes firmly established. He makes the sacrifice have a support and obtains a support himself.

120[6]. Three metres convey the sacrifice: the Gāyatrī, the Triṣṭubh and the Jagatī. With these the Anuṣṭubh is completely coinciding[7]. By means of this the gods wished to reach heaven. They did not reach it. They added the four domesticated animals to it: cow, horse, goat and sheep. Thereby (i.e. by the 32 syllables of the Anuṣṭubh extended with the 4 mentioned items) they reached it. Having reached heaven they said: "A great one (*bṛhatī*), forsooth, it was by which we have reached this". Therefore the Bṛhatī (of 36 syllables) is called Bṛhatī. There was no metre called Bṛhatī before that time. This Bṛhatī means cattle[8].

With the same element by which they undertake the last part (*nidhana*), one introduces (*prastauti*) (this Bṛhatī). With the same again one also makes its actual beginning (*ādi*)[9]. Therefore animals have intercourse with the same (animal) from which they were born and they are again reborn from this same (animal)[10].

One should not utter the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation with the Bṛhatī, in order not to strike down[11] the cattle. If he should utter the *vaṣaṭ* exclamation with the Bṛhatī, he would strike down the cattle with a Vajra[12].

I. 2. 1. 4. *The Raurava and the Yaudhājaya* (121–124)

CH, 280–281; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.) 358–359; 362–364; Staal, *Pratidānam* 420–421; *Agni* I, 633; 638; *Auswahl*, 29–30; Oertel, *JAOS* 18 (1897), 48.
JB. 1, 322–323; PB 7, 5, 6–15.

121. After the gods had killed the Asuras they regarded themselves as unclean and impure. They wished: "May we be clean, pure and 'sterilized'[1]; may we go to heaven". They saw these verses. Thereby they became purified: "Purifying yourself you flow, o Soma, in streams, clothing yourself in water"[2]. Water is a means of purification. With water they became purified. "Giving riches you take your seat on the place where cosmic order is regulated"[3]. Cosmic order is the space between heaven and earth. Thereby they passed the space between heaven and earth. "As a god who is the golden fountain"[4]. The divine fountain is yonder world. Thereby they came to heaven. Then they became clean, pure and 'sterilized' and went to heaven. He who has praised with these[5] verses becomes clean, pure and 'sterilized' and goes to heaven.

122. On these (verses they sing) the Raurava (Sāman). Agni Rūru[6] saw this Sāman. Because Agni Rūru saw this Sāman, therefore the Raurava is called Raurava.

Rūra Itivṛddhra[7], desiring cattle, performed austerities. He saw this Sāman. He praised with it. He used this (word) *iḷā* (as finale). Iḷā means cattle[8]. Then he obtained cattle. Therefore this Sāman procures cattle. He who knows this, obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle. And because Rūra Itivṛddhra saw it, therefore also it is called Raurava.

And now the Yaudhājaya. Indra, who was living by war[9], saw this Sāman. Because Indra, who was living by war (*yudhājīvan*) saw this Sāman, therefore the Yaudhājaya is called Yaudhājaya. He who knows thus overcomes his hating rival without fighting (*ayudha*) as it were.

Yudhājīva Vaiśvāmitra, desiring a firm support, performed austerities. He saw this Sāman. He praised it. Then he obtained a firm support. Therefore this Sāman is a firm support. He who knows thus gets a firm support. And because Yudhājīva Vaiśvāmitra saw it, therefore also it is called Yaudhājaya.

123. After the gods had thoroughly cleared the Asuras of all they had[10] by means of the Yaudhājaya they took away the property of them who were roaring (*ravamāṇānām*) by means of the Raurava. He who knows thus clears his hating rival out by means of the Yaudhājaya and takes away the property of him who is roaring by means of the Raurava Sāman[11].

By means of the Raurava Sāman the gods went upwards to heaven. The Asuras ascended after them, saying *o vā*. The gods perceived this.

They saw this Stobha. By means of this (which runs:) *o hā u vā* they threw them downwards[12]. Singing *utso devo hirā hā u vā*[13] they made them touch the earth. The Sāman had reached its end as it were. Heaven should stretch out upwards[14]. The Udgātṛ comes after (*ūrdhvam* "upwards from") the Pratihāra. (This is done) in order to reach heaven. (He sings) *nyāyā au ho vā iḷā*. He reaches heaven after having secured continuity (between Pratihāra and Upadrava) by means of the tone[15].

The number of Sāmans[16], their systematization and their symbolical implications[17] amount to this: A Sāman has the Svarita tone on its last vowel (it is *svāra*). The tone is breath. And it also has (i.e. may have) a finale. The finale is the self. And it is ending in the word *iḷā*. The *iḷā* is cattle[18]. Thereby he connects breath, self and cattle. There is praised with every possible systematization of the Sāmans and with all the symbolical implications of the Sāmans by him who knows thus.

124. There are forsooth two (kinds of) Sāmans: with Stobha and without Stobha. Of these two the one with Stobha means nobility, the one without Stobha the Brahmin class. He who knows thus wins the nobility and the Brahmin class.

And now the Yaudhājaya Sāman which has three finales[19] in order to correspond to the arrangement of the Soma pressings. By means of the Pavamāna food is given to the gods. It has finales in the interior (of the Sāman) for the sake of setting apart some food[20]. For if all the food should be given to the gods, there would not be left food here for the human beings and the animals to live upon. It has finales in its interior in order to set some food apart.

The Asuras wished to disturb[21] the sacrifice of the gods, during the time when the Dakṣiṇās are given and there is no singing of Stotras or recitation of Śastras. The gods noticed this. They saw this Sāman. Thereby they praised. They took the Morning pressing by means of the first finale, the Midday pressing by means of the second one and the Third pressing by means of the third one. They raised these Vajras. The Asuras did not dare to undertake anything against these raised Vajras. Then the gods succeeded and the Asuras were conquered. He who knows thus becomes successful and his hating rival is conquered. And that Pavamāna is perfect in which[22] there is a Sāman with three finales with a view to the arrangement of the pressings.

I. 2. 1. 5. *The Aušana* (125–127)

CH, 281–282; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 360–361; 363–364; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 421; *Agni* I, 638; *Auswahl*, 31–32; Oertel, *JAOS* 28 (1907), 81–98 (cf. Caland's transl. of BŚS. 18, 46 in *AbhKM* 12/1 (1903), 26 ff., also quoted by Oertel, o.c., 81, n. 2); J. Hertel, *Indische Märchen* (no place, no date), 10–11; Rau, *AS* 20

(1966), 79–81; *German Scholars on India* I, 208 f.; O'Flaherty, *Sex and Violence*, 89–90.
JB. 1, 324; PB. 7, 5, 16–20.

125. The gods and the Asuras joined in battle but did not gain the decisive victory during a long time. Bṛhaspati was the Purohita of the gods, Uśanas Kāvya[1] of the Asuras. The magic-power[2] applied on the one side, was also applied on the other side. The magic power was one and the same and did not produce a decisive victory. The Gandharva Triśīrṣan[3] knew how the ultimate victory could be obtained by them. He was a jealous man[4]. In the midst of the waters he had a floating ship-town[5]. Then Indra noticed: Triśīrṣan knows how we can win the victory. He importuned[6] his wife, since he was desirous of this victory. He said to her: "Ask your husband: 'Which of the two parties, the gods and the Asuras, who have been engaged in battle already during a long time, will win the victory?'" When they were having this talk, he (i.e. her husband) arrived[7]. At the same moment he (i.e. Indra) turned into a leech or a blade of grass and clung[8] to the deck of the ship[9]. She asked her husband: "Which of the two parties, the gods and the Asuras, who have been engaged in battle during a long time, will win the victory?"

126. "Not (so) aloud" he said; "the floor has ears". Therefore even now people say here: "Not (so) loud. The floor has ears"[10]. "Never mind", she said, "do tell!" He said: "These two Brahmins know the same, Bṛhaspati among the gods and Uśanas Kāvya among the Asuras. What these two do, that comes to the same. The same offerings which the one brings, are brought by the other. They meet and go apart again each to their own place of departure[11]. If one of the two will join the other one of the two parties, then this party will win". Having noticed this Indra flew away after having become a parrot. Having seen him flying away he said: "They will become victorious for whose benefit that green-coloured one flies there". He (Indra) went to Uśanas Kāvya who was among the Asuras. He said to him: "O sage, what kind of foreign people[12] do you aid? You belong to us or we to you. Take our side." "How?" he said, "with what do you induce me to come?" "With these cows of plenty[13] of Virocana, the son of Prahlāda"[14]. With these, i.e. with (the verses beginning with) "Forth now"[15] they both ran forth. The Asuras followed[16] these two. They overtook these two. He said: "O Sage, the Asuras overtake us". "Arrange it so", he said, "that they do not[17] overtake us two". They took the following countermeasure:[18]

127. With the words "God Indu with good arms, who destroys curses and protects the communities[19], purifies himself, the father of the gods, the able progenitor, the pillar of heaven, the supporter of the earth"[20] hereby these two erected a pillar up to heaven. The Asuras did not pass beyond this[21]. These two came to the gods[22] with these wish-cows (i.e.

verses?). When these two arrived they[23] (the gods) praised them: "An inspired seer, leader of the peoples, cautious and prudent, through visionary power Uśanas[24], found the secret, hidden name of the cows, that which was hidden by them"[25]. These verses are connected with cattle. He who has praised with these verses obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle. On these verses the Auśana Sāman (is sung). For Uśanas Kāvya desired the immortal world of the Gandharvas among the gods[26]. He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Then he attained the immortal world of the Gandharvas among the gods. This is a world-finding Sāman. He who has praised with it attains the immortal world of the Gandharvas. Because Uśanas Kāvya saw it, therefore it is called Auśana[27].

[28]It is provided with a particular tone (at the end). By means of a sound (or tone) at the end[29] (of the mantra) food is given to the gods. It becomes identical with the Ṛc[30] (in its Sāman-ending) at the end of the Pavamāna. They take care that the Sāman does not exceed the (last syllable of the) Ṛc and the Ṛc the (last syllable of the) Sāman. The fact that here and there in the Pavamāna they do not[31] chant (words from the Ṛc) is (done) for the sake of its equality (between Sāman and Ṛc), for the balance in its arrangement. At the beginning (of the Pavamāna) the Gāyatra Sāman has the 'circumflected' *padānusvara* ending, at the end at the conclusion of the Pavamāna (the Auśana) has the 'circumflected' *padānusvara* ending[32]. Therefore the creatures have airs in two directions, upwards and downwards[28].

The Gāyatrī metre is applied in two Sāmans. It is this downward air. Therefore one produces something twofold with this air: stools[33] and winds.

The Bṛhatī is applied in two Sāmans. It is this forward air. Therefore one produces something twofold with this air: one emits seed and one urinates[34].

The Triṣṭubh is applied to one Sāman. It is the navel[35]. There is only one Sāman (chanted) on this (metre). Therefore one does only one thing with this air, i.e. when one breathes up, one's navel correspondingly 'breathes up'[36].

I. 2. 2. *The four Pṛṣṭha lauds* (128–155)

CH, 305–325; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 690–708; II, 1 (S.S.), 388–413; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 422–425; *Agni* I, 641–646; *Auswahl*, 25–47.
JB. 327–335; PB. 7, 6–10; 8, 1–3.

I. 2. 2. 1. *The first Pṛṣṭha laud: Bṛhat and Rathantara* (128–137)

CH, 305–310; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 690–693; II, 1 (S.S.), 388–392; Staal,

Pratidānam, 422–423; *Agni* I, 641–642; *Auswahl.* § 25–33 (128–130; 133–137). JB 1, 291–298; 327–332; PB. 7, 6–7; JŚS. 1, 17; LŚS. 2, 9; DŚS. 6, 1.

128. When Prajāpati created the Bṛhat and the Rathantara, he first saw the mind: the Bṛhat. He spoke over it speech: the Rathantara. Because he spoke speech, the Rathantara, (over it), therefore the Rathantara comes to be 'yoked' (i.e. applied) first[1]. And because he saw mind, the Bṛhat, in the beginning, therefore these two (Sāmans) are (mentioned in the Dvandva compound in this order) *bṛhadrathantare*[2]: first mind, then speech.

[3]The Bṛhat is mind, the Rathantara speech. The Rathantara is the Ṛc, the Bṛhat is the Sāman. The Rathantara is the Brahmin class, the Bṛhat the nobility. The Rathantara is this world, the Bṛhat is yonder world[3].

That which moves, so to say, belongs to the Rathantara, that which stands to the Bṛhat[4]. The animals which have front teeth in one of the two jaws only[5], are connected with the Rathantara, those who have front teeth in both jaws are connected with the Bṛhat. The horizontal lightning is connected with Rathantara, the vertical one with the Bṛhat. He (the Udgātṛ) should collect[6] the powers of the Rathantara before he chants the Rathantara: "With your power which is in fire, which is in the water, with your power which is in the chariot and the one which is in the thunder, with your power which is in the wind therewith become united, o Rathantara; be full of riches for us"[7]. It becomes full of riches for the Udgātṛ, full of riches for the sacrificer, full of riches for the offspring (or: the subjects)[8].

129. The gods and the Asuras were at strife. The gods created a razor-edged Vajra: man. They hurled him at the Asuras. Having dispersed the Asuras he came back and turned against the gods. The gods became afraid of him. Having taken hold of him[9] they pushed him away into the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. This razor-edged Vajra is the *puruṣa* in the Bṛhat and the Rathantara[10]. Whomsoever he may hate, he puts in the mouth of the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. If the Soma sacrifice has the Rathantara (in the first Pṛṣṭha-stotra), he (the Udgātṛ) should say, after the Prastāva has been chanted: "Honour to mother Earth; o Rathantara, do not injure me"[11]. If the Soma sacrifice has the Bṛhat (in the first Pṛṣṭha-stotra), he should say: "I take refuge with father Heaven; o Bṛhat, do not injure me"[11]. Then he should follow up and recite: "Take away through the lifebreaths the lifebreaths of so and so. Take away his life, his lifebreaths, with a sharp cut. Being angry strike[12] him in anger with a stick. Bend the bow and hit him with an arrow"[13]. He puts him in the mouth of the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. He whom he hates loses his life before the end of the year. He who knows the 'divine' (i.e. symbolical)[14] chariot comes into possession of a chariot. The 'divine'

chariot is sacrifice. Its front part[15] is the Out-of-doors laud, its horses the Bṛhat and the Rathantara, its thongs with which the horses are yoked the Ājyastotras, its two reins the two Pavamānas, its two sides[16]—

130. —the Auśana and the Kāva Sāmans, its two axle-pins the Naudhasa and Kāleya, its standing-place for the charioteer in the front part[17] the Vāmadevya, its floor[18] the Yajñāyajñīya, its charioteer man[19]. This is the 'divine' chariot. He who knows thus comes into possession of a chariot. If the Soma sacrifice has the Rathantara (in the first Pṛṣṭha-stotra), he should not exclude the Bṛhat. If the Soma sacrifice has the Bṛhat (in the first Pṛṣṭha-stotra), he should not[20] exclude the Rathantara. *ho* is the Bṛhat with a Rathantara element. After the Prastāva of the Bṛhat he should start the Ādi part of the Sāman after having recited *ho*. The Rathantara with a Bṛhat element is *ā*. After the Prastāva of the Rathantara he should start the Ādi part of the Sāman after having recited *ā*[21]. Thereby he yokes the Rathantara to the head[22] of the Bṛhat. He takes care that the 'divine' chariot has more than one horse, establishes the sacrifice and becomes established himself.

The Rathantara is the 'divine' chariot[23]. After the Prastāva of the Rathantara he should touch the earth[24] with both hands in order that the 'divine' chariot should not become unstable.

131. He makes a Stobha of one syllable. Therefore the chariot is continuously stabilized by every single spoke[25].

He makes two Stobha syllables. Two are the sides of the 'divine' chariot. By means of the two sides he thereby gives stability to the 'divine' chariot.

He makes three Stobha syllables. The sacrificer has two feet and he himself (i.e. the priest) is the third (item). Thereby he obtains a secure position with his sacrificer. Moreover there are three worlds here. These he obtains thereby.

He makes four Stobha syllables. There are four quarters of space and the cattle have four feet. Thereby he obtains a secure position in (all) the quarters as well as in cattle.

He makes five Stobha syllables. Sacrifice is fivefold[26] and cattle is fivefold. Thereby he obtains a secure position in sacrifice and cattle.

He makes six Stobha syllables. There are six seasons. Thereby he obtains a secure position in the seasons. There are also six metres[27]. These he obtains thereby.

He makes seven Stobha syllables. The Śakvarīs have seven lines. Thereby he obtains a secure position in the Śakvarī, (which means) in cattle[28]. Moreover there are seven metres which increase by four syllables[29] and seven primary vital powers[30]. These he obtains thereby.

He makes eight Stobha syllables. The Gāyatrī has eight syllables. The

Gāyatrī means brilliance and splendour based on wisdom[31]. He obtains a secure position in brilliance and splendour. And moreover in cattle with eight hoofs.

132. He makes nine Stobha syllables. There are nine vital powers[32] in man. Thereby he could take away the vital powers of his hating rival. He places vital powers in himself. Moreover[33] he obtains the Stotra of the Trivṛt laud (= 3 × 3).

He makes ten Stobha syllables. The Virāj has ten syllables. The Virāj means food[34]. Thereby he obtains a secure position in the Virāj, in food. Moreover there are ten vital powers[35]. These he obtains thereby.

He makes eleven Stobha syllables. The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables. The Triṣṭubh is power and strength[36]. Thereby he obtains a secure position in power[37] and strength.

He makes twelve Stobha syllables. The Jagatī has twelve syllables. The Jagatī is cattle[38]. Thereby he obtains a secure position in the Jagatī, in cattle. Moreover there are twelve months. These he obtains thereby.

He makes thirteen Stobha syllables. Thereby he obtains the thirteenth, additional month[39].

He makes fourteen Stobha syllables. The year is fourteenfold[40]. Thereby he obtains a secure position in the year.

He makes fifteen Stobha syllables. There are fifteen nights and days in a half-month. Half-month by half-month he obtains the year.

He makes sixteen Stobha syllables. Man is sixteenfold[41]. Thereby the (disappearing sixteen) digits (of the moon) oppress and drive away the evil, hating rival. He reaches prosperity himself. Moreover he obtains the Stotra of the Sixteenfold laud.

He makes seventeen Stobha syllables. Prajāpati is seventeenfold[42]. Thereby he obtains a secure position with Prajāpati.

133. He should make this Stobha-singing different. He should not[43] chant the Ṛc-verse. In that he chants the Ṛc, thereby he does not make a differentiation with the form[44] of the Rathantara. For the Rathantara is the Ṛc and the Bṛhat is the Sāman. And if he should apply Stobhas, he must make eight Stobha syllables. And he closes his eyes[45] during that time. At (the words) 'seeing the light' he should open them again in order not to be deprived of his eye-sight[46].

If he should chant as Pratihāra *īśānam indra*, the Lord (*īśāna*)[47] would be insidious against the cattle of the sacrificer. And when he chants as Pratihāra *śānam indra*, the lord is not insidious against the sacrificer's cattle and the creatures are peaceful[48].

At every Pratihāra he should say *iḷā*. The Iḷā means cattle and the Rathantara is a homestead. Thereby he establishes these cows in the homestead (of the sacrificer)[49]. He should say *nasthuṣaḥ*. If he were to

say *tasthuṣaḥ*, his prosperity would come to a standstill[50]. But if he says *nasthuṣaḥ*, his prosperity does not become stagnant and things are going well with his cattle[51].

He should separate (i.e. differentiate) the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. If he were not to differentiate, these two would completely crush his offspring and cattle just as two big trees might come into collision and crush each other's branches[52]. The (finale of the) Bṛhat is *ho vā hā*, (that of) the Rathantara *o vā hā*. Thereby he separates the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. He who knows thus becomes separated from evil[53].

134. He who is expansive should execute it just as it is. He who has a rival (should also execute it) as it is[54]. He becomes victorious himself who knows thus and his hating rival is lost.

When the Bṛhat and the Rathantara were created the creatures and cattle became frightened for fear of these two. The two of them examined themselves (asking): "What is the awful aspect of us for fear of which the creatures and cattle became frightened?". They saw (that it was) these two finales. After having placed these two in the forest[55], they went to the village. That became a natural salt plain[56]. Therefore they say: "One should not settle on a natural salt plain[57]. One might become poorer by settling on a natural salt plain". By the finales of Bṛhat and Rathantara this was burnt. These Bṛhat and Rathantara are to be sung in the Grāmageya without finales. In the village (*grāma*) and without finales one may freely praise with these two.

135. He sings the Prastāva (of the first verse) on eight syllables, the next two on two syllables, in order to have enough speed at the start[58] and not to fall short. He sings the Prastāva (of the first verse) on eight syllables, the next two on two syllables. Thereby he raises the biped (= man) above the animals which have eight hoofs. Therefore the biped is set over the eight-hoofed animals. He sings the Prastāva (of the first verse) on eight syllables, the next two on two syllables. That amounts to twelve. The year consists of twelve months[59]. The year is Prajāpati, is sacrifice[60]. Thereby he obtains the year, Prajapāti, sacrifice. He makes the Rathantara standing on the syllable (or: the imperishable). Therefore the chariot is continuously stabilized by every single spoke[61]. Having isolated[62] the (single) Asuras by means of the Rathantara the gods held them down by means of the Bṛhat as by a net. Having isolated his hating rival by means of the Rathantara he who knows thus holds him down by means of the Bṛhat as by a net. By means of the Rathantara the gods went up to heaven. The nine times ninety Asuras and Rakṣas[63] covered these (terrestrial) worlds (and thereby formed an obstruction)[64]. They were called the Rathas. Having chanted the Rathantara and having mounted the Rathantara they went to heaven. They said: "We have passed (*atāriṣma*) these Rathas". That is the

reason why the Rathantara is called Rathantara. He who knows thus passes his hating rival.

136. The Rathas are hunger; the Rathantara is food[65]. By means of food one destroys hunger. Having destroyed hunger every time by means of food they ascended to heaven. The gods wished to go to heaven by means of the Bṛhat. They could not reach it with this. They added the Uṣṇih and the Kakubh to it. Thereby they reached it. Having gone to heaven they spoke: "It was something great (or: high: *bṛhat*) by which we reached heaven." Therefore the Bṛhat is called Bṛhat.

He who wishes to go to heaven should make twelve risings[66]. He who is desirous of rain should upset the water-holder[67]. The distance from here to heaven amounts to the number of syllables of the Bṛhatī and of the Uṣṇih and Kakubh. He who knows thus reaches heaven.

137. And now the Bṛhat. The Bṛhat is mind. The Prastāva has twelve syllables. For so large is the Sāman. The year consists of twelve months. The Sāman is the year. The three risings of the Bṛhat are these worlds. They become again nine[68], the (nine) vital powers. Mind is the tenth, There are twelve forms of the Bṛhat, i.e. the months. The months are the rays, the rays are the Maruts[69]. By these yonder sun is maintained (in heaven). He who knows this so and desires "May I have maintenance here" gets maintenance there. He who knows the trace[70] of the Bṛhatī in the Bṛhat, widely extends himself in offspring and cattle. The Bṛhatī-trace in the Bṛhat consists of twelve syllables. It should be chanted by him while he lengthens out as it were[71]. He who knows the Trivṛt connected with powers[72] which is produced in the Bṛhat, attains everything which belongs to the Kṣatriya class. The (nine) risings are the Trivṛt of the Bṛhat which is connected with powers[73]. He who knows thus obtains the glory of a Kṣatriya although he is a Brahmin.[74]

Indra having thrown his Vajra at Vṛtra and thinking: "I have not brought him down" went away to the farthest distance. Prajāpati wished with regard to him then[75]: "May he be (in power)"[76]. He invited him to come back with the words *o ho*. Then he was (there and came again into power). An expelled[77] king should make the sounds *o ho*. He returns.

I. 2. 2. 2. *The second Pṛṣṭha laud: the Vāmadevya* (138–144)

CH, 314–315; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 702–703; II, 1, (S.S.), 398–401; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 423–424; *Agni* I, 643; *Auswahl*, 34–37.
JB. 1. 333; PB. 7, 8–9; 1, 17; LŚS. 2, 10, 1; DŚS. 6, 2, 1.

138. When the gods went to war against the Asuras, they said: "Let us wage war after we have concealed that which is our dearest treasure, in order that[1] we take recourse[2] unto it, when to-day something[3] has happened". Cattle now was their treasure. Having concealed that they

went to war. The gods gained the victory over the Asuras. Coming off triumphantly they returned to it (i.e. the treasure) which had become unified. They did not know what was dear and belonged to the one and what to the other. They said: "Let us divide this". They did not agree on its division, and they said: "Let us put our case before[4] Prajāpati". They put their case before Prajāpati. Prajāpati said: "This treasure belongs to all of you together. They will praise all of you herewith. It will come[5] to all of you. Do not divide it".

In that they sing this laud on Gāyatrī verses, thereby it belongs to Agni. For Agni is associated with the Gāyatrī[6]. In that the Pṛṣṭha Stotra belongs to the midday service, thereby it belongs to Indra[7]. In that they sing this laud on verses containing the word *ka*[8], thereby it belongs to Prajāpati. In that it is 'unexpressed', thereby it belongs to the All-gods[9]. In that they sing the laud for the Maitrāvaruṇa priest[10], thereby it belongs to Mitra and Varuṇa.

The Vāmadevya (is a Sāman which) relates to cattle[11]. He should not move while singing in order not to remove the cattle. If he should move while singing he would remove the cattle. Now they say: "He should be covered and not move while singing, lest an onlooker should curse him". This is something to be supported very much[12]. He should indeed be covered and not move while singing.

139. They used to place a cube[13] on the head of (every member of) the clan[14], thinking: "He who does not let it fall off his head while singing, should be our Udgātṛ". This is also something to be supported in this connection, provided that at any rate there can be sung (i.e. that an Udgātṛ can be selected in this way)[15].

He sings three of its syllables in a hidden way—these worlds are three; the Vāmadevya is Prajāpati[16] and Prajāpati is the one who brings near to the worlds—(thinking) "He who brings near to the worlds, must bring us near to the worlds". He should bring a bull towards the laud of the Vāmadevya. The bull is the sounds *sau kau khā*[17]; the Vāmadevya is the womb. The bull means procreation. Thereby he places procreation by means of something procreative in the womb, in order to produce offspring.

It should be sung in a mysterious way as it were. He should not 'touch' the verse[18]. The Vāmadevya is a bird. If he should touch the verse, then this would be like a bird flying in the space which bumps up against a tree.

He should not take breath in between two words[19]. If he should breathe in between two words, this would be like falling into a pit. He should only take breath after the last word (of the Udgītha)[20]. This is like breathing up after having climbed from the one step to the other.

140. The Sāman is thereby interrupted as it were at the Pratihāra[21]. He should pass over (this interruption) by paying no attention to the

Pratihāra and singing *kayā śacāyi vā rto hāyi*[22]. However, that is also something which is very inappropriate[23]. He might prematurely become deprived of breath[24]. While the Pratihāra is sung[25] (by the Pratihartṛ) the Udgātṛ should speak the word *vāc*[26]. Brahman is *vāc*. Thereby he redresses this by means of *vāc*, i.e. Brahman.

The waters were the wives of the gods. They desired to have intercourse. They were (sexually) approached by Mitra and Varuṇa. Then they became pregnant. Thereupon the Revatī verses (i.e. the verses connected with richness: *re* = *rayis*) which are cattle, were born. For someone who desires cattle he should carry out this (Vāmadevya) on Revatī verses[27]. He (i.e. the sacrificer) becomes rich in cattle. However, he runs the risk of becoming without progeny[28]. For he passes from the verses with *ka* (i.e. with Ka, with Prajāpati). Now Bharadvāja saw this Pṛśni-stotra (i.e. Stotra of the dappled cows): *kayā naś citra abhuvad/revatīr na sadhāmade*[29]*/'bhī ṣū ṇaḥ sakhīnām*. In that he inserts one Revatī verse in the middle, thereby he does not pass from the cattle. And in that two verses with *ka*, i.e. verses belonging to Prajāpati, are on both sides, thereby he does not pass from progeny.

It is a Sāman which ends in a Svarita accent[30]. Sound (*svara*) is breath[31]. Thereby he puts breath in the cattle[32]. However, he runs the risk of chanting away[33] the cattle of the sacrificer, if he should make it (the Sāman) without a Nidhana[34]. He should close in[35] the breath.

141. He should make the two[36] latter parts of the last verse as follows: *avitā jarāyitṝṇām ā auho hā yi śatām bhavasy auho huṃ mā tā yā huṃ mā*.[37] This is like driving cattle inside[38] the cowshed by means of a bolt[39] and closing them in with it. As to this they say: "It should be made ending in a particular tone which lies inside the *yoni*[40]". If someone should criticize him who does so[41], with the words: "You have chanted away the cows of the sacrificer with the tone (or: sound)", he should say to him: "The Rathantara which has a Nidhana precedes, the Naudhasa which has a Nidhana follows. By these two offspring and cattle are enclosed on both sides. I[42] have placed life (or: breath) amidst[43] the cattle". If someone should criticize him who does so, this one comes to distress.

The Gāyatrī has eight syllables; there are eight Vasus. The morning pression is connected with the Gāyatrī. To every syllable corresponds a deity.

The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables; there are eleven Rudras. The midday pression is connected with the Triṣṭubh. To every syllable corresponds a deity.

The Jagatī has twelve syllables; there are twelve Ādityas. The third pression is connected with the Jagatī. To every syllable corresponds a deity.

Now (they say) "Whereby do they bring the sacrificer to a state of

correspondence with the sacrifice?". He should say: "When Prajāpati created the Vāmadevya, he extracted three syllables. This became (the word) man (*puruṣa*) consisting of three syllables. In the Vāmadevyastotra he should pronounce the word *puruṣaḥ*[44]. Thereby they bring the sacrificer to a state of correspondence with the sacrifice".

Now they say: "He should not pronounce the word *puruṣaḥ*, he should secretly think it, he should conceal it by his thought". Now they also say: "One should not secretly think something, one should not conceal by thought. In that one knows something, thereby it is obtained".

142. When the gods went to war against the Asuras, they said: "Let us wage war after we have concealed that which is our dearest treasure, in order that we take recourse unto it, when today something has happened". The breaths of life now were their dearest treasure. Having concealed this they went to war. This (treasure) became unified (as life) and continuously created[45] verses, chants and formulas, the cow, the horse, the goat, the sheep, rice, barley, the Brahmin, the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya, the Śūdra, all which exists. Then they told them: "That dearest treasure of you has become unified and continuously creates (new life)". The gods gained the victory over the Asuras. Coming off triumphantly they returned to this (treasure) which had become unified. They did not know what was dear and belonged to the one and what to the other. They said: "Let us divide this". They did not agree on its division. Then it said to them: "They will praise all of you with me. I will come to all of you. Do not divide me".

In that they sing this laud on Gāyatrī verses, thereby it belongs to Agni. For Agni is associated with the Gāyatrī. In that the Pṛṣṭha Stotra belongs to the midday pression, thereby it belongs to Indra. In that they sing this laud on verses containing the word *ka*, thereby it belongs to Prajāpati. In that it is 'unexpressed', thereby it belongs to the All-gods. In that they sing the laud for the Maitrāvaruṇa priest, thereby it belongs to Mitra and Varuṇa.

Then it said to them: "Create out of me". "All right". They applied sound to it and said: "Create".

143[46]. Then it created the Rathantara. And together with it the sound of a chariot was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they produce the sound of a chariot at the singing of the Rathantara. One should know then: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create". Then it created the Bṛhat. And together with it the sound of Parjanya was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they beat the drums at the singing of the Bṛhat. Parjanya (then) causes to rain. One should know then: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create". Then it created the Vairūpa (Sāman). And together with it the sound of a (swiftly moving) troop[47] was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they make the sound of a troop at the singing of the Vairūpa. One should know then: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create". Then it created the Vairāja. And together with it the sound of fire was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they churn out fire at the singing of the Vairāja. One should know then: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create". Then it created the Śākvara. And together with it the sound of water was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they sing the Śākvara Stotra after having placed water in the nearness. One should know: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create". Then it created the Raivata. And together with it the sound of cattle was created. They said: "We have been successful with this Stotra". Therefore they produce the sound of cattle at the singing of the Raivata: they cause the calves to bellow together with the cows. One should know then: "We have been successful with this Stotra".

They said: "Create".

144. Then it did not create (anymore). It rose upwards like a top (*pṛṣṭha*) (of a mountain), like a summit. The gods took hold of it and went upwards. They said: "So far this universe extends[48]. This is the dearest (*vāmam*) of us, of the gods (*devānām*)". Therefore the Vāmadevya is called Vāmadevya.

[49]The Vāmadevya forsooth is the father and the mother of the Sāmans. Whatever the son neglects, that is settled by the father, that is warded off by the father.

That which is centrally[50] done is for appeasement (or: settlement) and for warding off (or: defence). On the one hand the Vāmadevya is later than the Sāmans which have already been chanted. On the other hand it is earlier than those which have not yet been chanted[51]. This is for their settlement and defence.

It should be chanted independently[52] (*svadhūr*), not high, not low so to say[53]. If he should chant with a high pitch, he would go along the way[54] of his superior rival. If he should chant with a low pitch, he would go along the way of this inferior rival. This is his own duty (or: burden, *dhūr*) namely this intermediate world[55]. This hurts (*dhūrvati*)[56] him who hurts someone who knows thus.

Now they say: "This (intermediate world) is within a span of touching[57] this[58] world, within a span of reaching yonder world". And

they also say: "It is within a new-born calf's membrane (i.e. within an ace) of touching this world and reaching yonder world". And they also say: "It is within a pellicle (found) in the faeces of touching this world and reaching yonder world". Therefore it should be chanted by someone who considers it like this as it were. As to this they also say: "As two wheels are firmly fixed by an axle[59], thus these two worlds are firmly fixed by this (Vāmadevya). He softly touches (i.e. fondles) as it were this world and yonder world[60].

He should not adapt himself to someone else's course in chanting[61]. He who adapts himself to someone else's course in chanting, runs the risk of becoming dependent. It should be chanted independently.

He who knows what is pleasant (*madhu*)[62] for the gods becomes someone who is authorized to drink Soma (*madhavya*). The Vāmadevya is that which is pleasant for the gods[63]. He who knows thus becomes someone who is authorized to drink Soma.

I. 2. 2. 3. *The third Pṛṣṭha laud: Naudhasa and Śyaita* (145–147)

CH, 318–319; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 705; II, 1 (S.S.), 403–406; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 424; *Agni* I, 644; *Auswahl*, 38–40; Bodewitz, "The 'marriage' of Heaven and Earth (JB. I, 145–146; PB. 7, 10, 1–9; AB. 4, 27, 5–10)", *WZKS* 26 (1982), 23–36; Caland, *Over en uit*, 39–40; n. 2 on tr. of PB. 7, 10, 3 (tr. of 1, 145)

JB. 1, 334; PB. 7, 10; LŚS. 2, 10, 2–3; DŚS. 6, 2, 2–3

145. [1]These two worlds were together, but became separated. Nothing of the two flew from the one to the other[2]. Men and gods became hungry.[3] For the gods live on what is given from here and men on what is given from yonder world[3]. They, (these worlds, i.e.) Bṛhat and Rathantara[4], said: "Let us intermarry with each other through (the exchange of) the bodies[5] which are our favourite ones. In the beginning the Śyaita was the favourite body of the Rathantara, the Naudhasa that of the Bṛhat. They intermarried through these two[6]. Yonder world (i.e. the Bṛhat) made from there saline particles the price paid for this (favourite woman)[7], this world made from here the smoke (of the sacrifice) the price paid for yonder (favourite). Yonder world made from there the rain the price paid for this (favourite), this world from here the Devayajana[8] the price paid for yonder (favourite).

He who knows what is right, however, considers these two (women) as given in marriage together with nuptial gifts[9]. Forsooth (this objection does not apply), they intermarried concubine for concubine[10]. Therefore they say: "One should not change partners with one's concubines". He raises himself to the level of the marriage of Bṛhat and Rathantara. He runs the risk of coming to ruin.

The two forms (of Bṛhat and Rathantara, i.e. Naudhasa and Śyaita) said: "Let us intermarry with our finales"[11].

146. In the beginning the finale of the Śyaita was the end of the Pāda[12], the finale of the Naudhasa was the word *vasu*. With these two (finales) they intermarried. Ever since that time people[13] here on earth live in each other's house (after marriage). Before that time they used to live everyone in the own house or everyone with his or her relatives.

They chant the laud with the Rathantara. The Rathantara is this world. Then with the Vāmadevya. The Vāmadevya is the intermediate space. Then with the Naudhasa. The Naudhasa is yonder world. He wins these worlds from here upwards in a continuous line. (Or) he chants the laud with the Bṛhat. The Bṛhat is yonder world. Then with the Vāmadevya. The Vāmadevya is the intermediate space. Then with the Śyaita. The Śyaita is this world. He wins these worlds from above in a continuous line. He who knows thus, wins both the rising and the descending worlds[14].

147. And now the Naudhasa[15]. Nodhas, the son of Kakṣīva who roamed about[16] a long time without finding certainty[17] desired: "I wish I would have certainty". When the gods were dividing the *brahman*[18] he flew[19] to them and said: "I am a seer, who makes verses. I have roamed about already during a long time without support. Give this in order that I may thereby find support." They gave the essence of the *brahman* to him. That became the Naudhasa Sāman. Thereby he chanted the laud. Then he obtained support (certainty). Therefore this Sāman means support. He who knows thus has a firm support. The Naudhasa is the essence of the *brahman*. He who knowing thus chants the laud with the Naudhasa, has chanted the laud with the essence of the *brahman*.

It has a finale consisting of two syllables[20] for the sake of obtaining firm support. For the sacrificer has two feet in order to stand. And because Nodha the son of Kakṣīvat saw it, therefore it is called Naudhasa.

I. 2. 2. 4. *Variations of the third Pṛṣṭha laud for special purposes* (148–152)

Auswahl, 48–52.

PB. 7, 10, 12–17; 8, 1–2

148. He who wishes to obtain cattle, should apply the Śyaita Sāman. Prajāpati created the cattle. Having been created they ran off from him. He desired: "May these cows not run away from me. May they return to me". He saw this Sāman and praised with it. He applied the word *vasu* ("possession") as its finale. This possession is cattle. Thereupon the

cattle return to him and they did not have anymore the habit of running away. He spoke: "I have submitted[1] (*śyetī . . akṛṣi*) these domestic animals". Therefore the Śyeta Sāman is called Śyeta. Therefore this is a Sāman which provides cattle. To him who knows thus the animals having been submitted (i.e. domesticated) become subservient[2], they return to him and they do not run away from him[3]. This (Sāman) has a finale of two syllables, in order to obtain firm support. For the sacrificer has two feet in order to stand.

149. He who has lost his mind should use the two Manaryās of Gotama[4]. Gotama lost his mind. He wished: "May my mind not be lost, may it enter me again". He saw these two Sāmans and praised with them. Thereupon his mind again entered him and did not leave him. Him who knows thus the mind enters again and it does not leave him. For the Rāthantara Agniṣṭoma this has the finale *pibā*, for the Bārhata *pibā ī*. Because Gotama did see them, they are called the two Manaryās of Gotama.

150. He who desires to obtain offspring should apply the two Janitras (= "birthplaces") of Vasiṣṭha[5]. Vasiṣṭha who had been overcome and who had lost his son[6] desired: "I would like to become rich in offspring and cattle". He saw these two Sāmans. He praised with them. Then he became rich in offspring and cattle. These two Sāmans produce fertility. He who knows thus becomes rich in offspring and cattle. For the Rāthantara Agniṣṭoma this has the finale *janitram*, for the Bārhata *jānitram*. And because Vasiṣṭha saw them, therefore they are called the two Janitras of Vasiṣṭha.

151. [7]He who wishes to obtain a full lifetime should apply the Sāman of Purumīḍha which has the word *dakṣa*[8] ("energy") as its finale. Taranta and Purumīḍha[9], the sons of Vitadaśva and Mahī, were the sons of Mahī, the daughter of Arcanānas[10]. A woman met them on their way and said to them: "My (*tyasyās*)[11] son has got fever. You should cure him for me". They were rather[12] angry and spoke: "How did she dare to speak to us in this way" (and they said to her): "Throw him in an abyss with hot vapours"[13]. The woman trusting (them and thinking:) "Two divine seers, makers of (magical) formulas have spoken to me" threw (him) in an abyss with hot vapours. When they came back she went towards[14] them and said: "The boy about whom you said: "Throw him in an abyss with hot vapours", is lying here thrown down in the abyss". They both thought that they had not acted correctly. They wished: "May we get out of this, may we find a way out and help, may this boy live". Then Purumīḍha saw this Sāman. He praised with it (singing:) "Praise Agni with songs for help, the sharp-flamed; Agni, the famous, o Purumīḍha, men (praise)"[15]. "What is his name?" "His name is Sudīti". Then he touched him (singing:) "Agni[16] is a protection for Sudīti". He

was still fainted away, when he came out. He reanimated him with the finale "for energy" (*dákṣā́ 3 yā* 2345 = *dakṣāya*)[17]. The vital airs are energy. Thereby he placed the vital airs in him. Therefore this Sāman procures a way out and help. For he obtained a way out and help thereby. He who knows thus obtains a way out and help. And because Purumīḍha saw it, therefore it is called the Paurumīḍha with the word *dakṣa* as finale.

152. [18]He who tries to bewitch (someone) or who has a rival should apply the Sāman called "Sevenfold Killer of Jamadagni"[19]. Jamadagni was the Purohita of the Māhenas[20]. He surpassed them in wealth. They desired to injure him. He thought: "How could I kill seven heads of cattle of each of them on one day?" He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Then he killed seven heads of cattle of each of them on one day. In the same way they also kill here (the cattle) of those (who have to be bewitched). Similarly also the killer of his rival[21]. He who knows thus kills his hating rival. And because Jamadagni saw it, therefore it is called the "Sevenfold Killer of Jamadagni". As to this also there is sung this (verse)[22]:

"They were rising excessively and almost[23] rose enough to be able to touch the sky. Having injured Bhṛgu the Māhenas[24] were irretrievably[25] defeated".

He who injures someone who knows thus is irretrievably defeated.

I. 2. 2. 5. *The fourth Pṛṣṭha laud: Kāleya* (153–155)

CH, 323–325; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 708; II, 1 (S.S.), 411–413; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 424–425; *Agni* I, 645; *Auswahl*, 52–56; Bodewitz, "Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 153–155 on the Kāleya Sāman", *Surabhi, Sreekrishna Sarma Fel. Vol.*, 179–191.; O'Flaherty, *Sex and Violence*, 86–87.
JB. 1, 335; PB. 8, 3.

153. The gods and the Asuras were fighting for the sacrifice. The gods drove[1] the Asuras out of the Bahiṣpavamāna. The Asuras moved to the Āgneya Ājya, the gods to the Maitrāvaruṇa Ājya; the Asuras to the Aindra Ājya, the gods to the Aindrāgna Ājya; the Asuras to the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna, the gods to the Rathantara; the Asuras to the Vāmadevya, the gods to the Naudhasa; the Asuras to the Kāleya. Then they (the gods) followed[2] them into the Kāleya. By means of the Kāleya they drove them out of the Kāleya. Because they drove them out (*akālayanta*) therefore Kāleya is called Kāleya. He who knows thus drives away his hating rival.

They (the Asuras) went away (and spread) over the regions (i.e. in all directions). They (the gods) successively[3] drove them away (from the one quarter of space to the other) by means of the Kāleya. Because they

drove them away (or: persecuted them)[4] (*akālayanta*) successively, therefore the Kāleya is called Kāleya. He who knows thus successively drives away (or: persecutes) his hating rival (from the one place to the other).

The sacrifice is power (*taras*), the Stoma is 'finding goods', (*vidadvasu*)[5]. By means of the sacrifice and the Stoma forsooth they dislodged them. He who knows thus dislodges his rival enemy by means of the sacrifice and the Stoma.

154. [6]The Asuras were engaged with the Ṛc, the gods with the Sāman. Having seized the Asuras by the Ṛc[7] the gods oppressed[8] them by means of the Sāman. (By him who knows thus)[9] there should be oppressed (or: compressed, reduced) (in the chanting of the Sāman) for the sake of killing[10] his hating[11] rival. (He should sing as Udgītha) *indraṃ sabādha ūtāyā i bṛhad gāyantas sutasome a dhvārāi*[12]. Here *dhvārā* (or: *dhīro*) is (a form or characteristic)[13] of the Rathantara Sāman, *dhoro* of the Bṛhat Sāman[14]. Thereby it is in agreement with both these Sāmans. Therefore he should sing both forms, the one belonging to the Rathantara and the one belonging to the Bṛhat. The two Brahmasāmans (the third Pṛṣṭha-stotra chanted either on the Naudhasa Sāman or on the Śyaita Sāman) óf these two (i.e. Bṛhat and Rathantara) are separately applied (i.e. either the one or the other is sung in agreement with the application of either the Bṛhat or the Rathantara in the first Pṛṣṭha Stotra). But hereby this Sāman is in agreement with both (Bṛhat and Rathantara). Therefore he should sing both forms.

This (Sāman) has the word *iḷā* as finale[15]. The *iḷā* means cattle[16]. By means of cattle they (the gods) drove them (the Asuras) away. Therefore, when two rivals, a man possessing cattle and a man without cattle, are in conflict, the man who possesses cattle wins.

This Sāman scattered[17] these creatures. They apply this 'downward' *iḷā* at its end lest the creatures are thrown away out of their respective safe positions[18]. As a result the creatures are not thrown out of their own safe positions.

The gods, the forefathers and the human beings were on the one side, the Asuras, the Rakṣasas and the Piśācas on the other[19]. They were fighting for these worlds. However, the Kalis and the Gandharvas[20] occupied an intermediate (neutral) position[21]. They did not care for the one group nor for the other. The gods, the forefathers and the human beings overcame the Asuras, the Rakṣasas and the Piśācas. They divided these worlds. Heaven fell to the share of the gods, the Pitṛloka to the share of the forefathers and the human world to the share of the human beings. To them[22] came the Kalis and the Gandharvas and they said: "Give us a share in these worlds". "No" they said. "You remained neutral, not caring for the one party or the other". "But we shared[23]

your side in thought", they said, "give us also a share".

155. "No" they said. "These worlds have been divided by us. We will not be able to throw them into confusion". They said: "What we see here ourselves (i.e. what is our own desire), that must be ours". To them they gave the women of the Kalindas[24] saying "Try it on with these"[25]. Because they gave the women of the Kalindas to the Kalis, therefore Kalinda is called Kalinda.

Kali, the son of Vitadanya, saw this Sāman. He praised with it. Thereby he saw this country situated in the (south-eastern) intermediate region which is difficult to approach[26]. He won this country. Therefore this Sāman is worldwinning. He who praises with it obtains a world (in yonder world). However, he does not win a world beyond the world of the Gandharvas; he only[27] wins the world of the Gandharvas (and nothing more). And because Kali, the son of Vitadanya, saw (this Sāman), therefore it is also called Kāleya.

Having torn the third pressing from the two preceding ones the gods went to heaven. These worlds were torn asunder; sacrifice was torn asunder. The gods wished: "Let us put together these worlds; let us put together the sacrifice". They saw this Sāman. They praised with it. Thereby they put together these worlds and the sacrifice[28]. Because they put together these worlds, it (i.e. the Sāman) has a heavenly aspect for him (who applies this Sāman). Thereby he wins more than the world of the Gandharvas (i.e. he wins a place in heaven).

[29]The sacrifice is power (*taras*), the Stoma is 'finding goods' (*vidadvasu*)[29]. By means of the sacrifice and the Stoma foresooth they (the gods) put together these worlds and the sacrifice. For him who knows thus the sacrifice and these worlds become put together by means of the sacrifice and the Stoma.

The Kāleya forsooth is king Soma. His sacrifice becomes visited by the gods. Just as here a cow whose calf is tied up (to the milkpost[30]) comes running on and lows[31], even so forsooth Indra comes to the Soma-sacrifice in which they praise with the Kāleya Sāman. Therefore also one should never deviate[32] from (the standard practice of applying) this Sāman, thinking 'Let my sacrifice be visited by Indra, visited by the gods'. He makes his sacrifice visited by Indra, visited by the gods.

[33]This (Sāman) has the word *iḷā* as its finale. It is a Sāman related to the Śastra of the Acchāvāka priest. The *iḷā* is cattle. Thereby he becomes firmly established in cattle[33].

I. 3. *The third service* (1, 156–178).

CH, 329–382; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 710–776; II, 1 (S.S.), 415–456; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 425–429; *Agni* I, 646–655.

JB. 1, 336–341; PB. 8, 4–7; JŚS. 1, 18–19; LŚS. 2, 10, 4–20; DŚS. 6, 2, 4–21.

I. 3. 1. *The Ārbhava-Pavamāna laud. Its Sāmans and metres* (156–167).

CH, 337–343; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 727–729; II, 1 (S.S.), 420–429; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 425–427; *Agni* I, 646–649; *Auswahl*, 56–64.
JB. 1, 336–339; PB. 8, 4–5; JŚS. 1, 18.

I. 3. 1. 1. *The origin of the afternoon service. The Gāyatra Sāman* (156).

Auswahl, 56–57
JB. 3, 295; PB. 8, 4, 1 and 5.

156. In the beginning there were two pressings. With two pressings the gods became victorious here in the beginning. To them who were staying each in his own world after they had become victorious Indra came and spoke: "There are three metres; there are three breaths: exhalation, inhalation and circulation; there are three worlds here. They say: 'Among the gods (everything) is three(fold)'. Come on; let us make three pressings". They said: "We will not be able to do so. By this former action indeed we are still tired". Indra said: "I will create the third pressing out of myself". He created the third pressing out of himself. Therefore Indra is among the deities the one who is (connected with) the third pressing. He who knowing thus praises during the third service, praises with Indra among the deities.

The third pressing is sucked out as it were[1]. When Suparṇa fetched the pressing connected with the Jagatī, he sucked it[2]. Therefore it is squeezed as it were. Singing "by the most palatable"[3] they thereby put elixer and intoxication in it. They pour out the Āśir milk and are engaged in the animal sacrifice[4]. Thereby they refresh it.

The words "Killing demons, dwelling among all men, he has come to his seat (of wood) embossed in iron-work"[5] mean a connection (of the third pressing) with the two preceding pressings. On these verses the Gāyatra Sāman is sung of which the Brāhmaṇa has been taught already[6].

I. 3. 1. 2. *The Saṃhita Sāman* (157–158)

Auswahl, 57–58
JB. 1, 336; 3, 295; PB. 8, 4, 8–11

157. There is the Saṃhita Sāman with a finale of two syllables: for the sake of a firm support. The sacrificer has two feet: (therefore it is) for the sake of a firm footing (of the sacrificer)[1].

The gods and the Asuras were at strife. They said: "All which is our property on both sides, let us put that together. For that party of the two of us which wins, should be the combined property". They put together

what was the property on both sides. The gods wished: "May we win this combined property of both parties". They saw this Sāman. Thereby they praised. Thereby they won the combined (*saṃhitam*) property of both parties. Because they won the combined property of both parties, therefore the Saṃhita Sāman is called Saṃhita. He who knows thus wins the combined property of the two parties from his hostile rival[2].

158. The third pressing is separated[3] as it were from the midday pressing. The gods noticed this and they knew: "The third pressing is separated as it were from the midday pressing". They saw this Sāman. Thereby they put it together (with the midday pressing). Because they put it together (*saṃ-dhā*), therefore the Saṃhita Sāman is called Saṃhita. For him who knows thus the third pressing becomes connected (*saṃhita*) and not separated.

I. 3. 1. 3. *The Kakubh and Uṣṇih metres (belonging to the Sabha and Pauṣkala chants)* (158–159)

Auswahl, 58–59 and Caland's transl. in n. 2 on PB. 8, 5, 2.
JB. 1, 337; 3, 295; PB. 8, 5, 1–5.

158. (continued). [1]By means of the Uṣṇih and Kakubh verses[2] Indra standing on two Gāyatrī verses (as his legs) tried to raise his thunderbolt (and to hurl it) at Vṛtra. These two (Gāyatrī verses) were not able to raise it[3]. He added to them the quadrupeds cow, horse, goat and sheep. Then they were able to raise it. Standing on the Kakubh and the Uṣṇih he made the Sabha and Pauṣkala Sāmans his arms, hurled the Vajra and killed Vṛtra. He who knows thus kills his hostile rival.

159. (When he tried to raise the Vajra) he slipped off[4] with one leg forward and with the other backward. (The leg) by which he slipped off forward became the Kakubh. Therefore the Kakubh has most of its syllables in the anterior part. And (the leg) by which he slipped off backward became the Uṣṇih. Therefore the Uṣṇih has most of its syllables in the hind part. These two metres are the cow and the bull. Therefore the animals are of most use[5] by their fore and hind parts. They draw with the fore part and with the hind part they give milk and procreate. He who knows thus obtains both cow-milk and the milk (= seed) of the bull.

I. 3. 1. 4. *The Sabha and Pauṣkala Sāmans* (160)

Auswahl, 60 and Caland's transl. in n. 2–3 on PB. 8, 5, 6.
JB. 3, 296; PB. 8, 5, 6.

On these verses[1] the Sabha is sung for the sake of the lustre of the sacrifice, in order to give lustre to whatever part of the sacrifice that is sung or recited in a wrong way or deficiently. They apply this chant

thinking: "Let that which is without lustre become something provided with lustre"[2]. For its name tells that it is full of lustre.

By means of the Sabha the gods got the energy, force, power, virility, cattle and food of the Asuras in their power, by means of the Sabha they made themselves superior and victorious[3]. Therefore the Sabha is called Sabha ("conquering"). By means of the Sabha he who knows thus gets the energy, force, power, virility, cattle and food of his hostile rival in his power, by means of the Sabha he makes himself superior and victorious.

[4]Prajāpati produced the cattle. Having been created they ran off from him. He desired: "May these cows not run away from me. May they return to me". He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Thereupon the cattle returned to him and they did not have anymore the habit of running away[4]. He spoke: "I have become together (*sabha* = *saha* ?)[5] with my cattle". That is also a reason why the Sabha is called Sabha. He who knows thus becomes associated (*sabha*) and not dissociated (*a-vi-bha*) with cattle.

And this (Sāman) is sung on a verse in the Kakubh metre and it has the Svarita tone on its last vowel[6]. The tone is breath[7], the Kakubh[8] is a man's metre[9]. Breath is pre-eminency[10], man is pre-eminency. Thereby they[11] combine pre-eminency with pre-eminency and obtain a firm support in pre-eminency by means of pre-eminency. Moreover they thereby cause the sacrificer to be abundantly furnished[12] with life (-breath). For him who knows thus there is prosperity.

He (i.e. Prajāpati) could not discern these (cows) because they had one and the same colour. Then he saw the Pauṣkala Sāman. Thereby he differentiated their colours. They got different colours[13]: white, red, black. Before that time they had only one colour: red. He who knows thus obtains many-coloured[14] and differently coloured cows; he becomes rich in cattle.

And now the Pauṣkala chant. Pauṣkala Āṅgirasa desired cattle and practised austerity. He saw this Pauṣkala Sāman. He praised with it. Thereupon he obtained cattle. Therefore this Sāman provides cattle. He who knows thus obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle. And because Pauṣkala Āṅgirasa saw it therefore it is called Pauṣkala. It has a finale of four syllables. The cows have four legs. The Uṣṇih is cattle[15]. (This finale is applied) in order to obtain more cows in addition to these previously already obtained (on account of the Pauṣkala without the finale).

I. 3. 1. 5. *The Śyāvāśva Sāman; the Saumitra chants (the story of Lady Long-tongue)* (161–164)

Auswahl, 60–62 and Caland's transl. in n. 2 on PB. 13, 6, 10; Oertel, *Actes du onzième Congrès Intern. des Orient.*, 225 ff.; Rau, *AS.* 20, 78–79; O'Flaherty, *Sex and Violence*, 99–103.

JB. 1, 337–338; 3, 267; PB. 8, 5, 7–11 (espec. Caland's n. on 8, 5, 9)

161. If they should apply the metres in the regular order, they would make the Anuṣṭubhs the last. The Anuṣṭubh is speech[1]. They would place it outside the sacrifice (by applying it last). In the following way they give it a share of the sacrifice in the middle (of the sacrifice). The verses are these: "By fore-conquest of your plant"[2]. Beforehand these (verses) conquer evil, beforehand striking off evil they go. By means of these there is conquered. A complete victory is desired (by means of the verse) "for the intoxicating (Soma which is) pressed out pierce, o friends, the dog with the long tongue"[3].

Lady Long-tongue was a female Asura. She used to lick at the Soma everywhere. She was near the northern vessel[4] and used to lick from there at the Soma that was pressed out in the southern, in the eastern and in the western vessel. Indra who wished to seize her was not able to seize her. He said: "Let nobody sacrifice, for this Lady Long-tongue licks at the Soma everywhere".

162. Now there was a handsome man called Sumitra ("Goodfriend"), the son of Kutsa. To him he said: "Sumitra, you are handsome; women can easily be fooled by a handsome man. Try to fool[5] this Lady Long-tongue". He went to her and said: "O Dīrghajihvī, make love to me". She said: "You have only one penis and there are cunts in all my limbs. This does not fit."[6] He returned (to Indra) and said: "She said to me: "You have only one penis and there are cunts in all my limbs. This does not fit". He said: "I will make a penis on every limb of yours". Having covered these (penes) with his garment he came to her. He said to her: "Dīrghajihvī, make love to me". She said: "You have only one penis and there are cunts in all my limbs. This does not fit". He said: "On each limb of mine, forsooth. I have a penis". She said: "Well, let me have a look at yours"[7].

163. He showed them to her. They pleased her. She said: "Come. What is your name?". "I am Sumitra ("Goodfriend")[8] by name". "That is a nice name which you have" she said. They cohabitated. After he had reached satisfaction in her he took hold of her. She said: "Hey, maṇ, did not you call yourself Goodfriend"?[8]. He said: "I am Goodfriend for a good friend and Badfriend for a bad friend".

He saw these Saumitra chants[9]. He praised with them. With them he called upon Indra. Indra raised his Vajra in the form of an Anuṣṭubh

and came running near. With (the Anuṣṭubh) verse "By way of precautionary victory strike away, o friends, the long-tongued dog from your Soma plant in order that it may be intoxicating when it has been pressed out"[10] he pounded away at her. These are verses which kill the rival and kill the demons. He who praises with these verses kills his hating rival and strikes away the evil in the form of demons.

(He sings:) "Him who pressed out flows forth and round in a purifying stream, the sap like a strong horse, this *duroṣam* Soma, o men, may the stones subdue with a universal inspired hymn for the benefit of the sacrifice"[11]. This means a connection[12] with the two preceding pressings.

On these verses they sing the Śyāvāśva chant. [13]Leaving alone Śyāvāśva the son of Arcanānas, who had gone away in order to collect fuel[14] (for the sacrifice), his fellow-sacrificers went to heaven. He desired: "May I rise upwards to heaven after them and may I become united with my fellow-sacrificers". He saw this Sāman. He praised with it.

164. "By way of precautionary victory—come—strike away, o friends, the long-tongued dog—come—from your Soma plant in order that it may be intoxicating when it has been pressed out; hey come"[15] with these words the Maruts called upon him to come to heaven. Then he became united with his fellow-sacrificers. This Śyāvāśva became united with the Maruts. Therefore this is a Sāman which procures heaven. He who knows thus reaches heaven. And because Śyāvāśva the son of Arcanānas saw it, therefore it is called Śyāvāśva.

[16]Indra loathing from the third pressing went away. For it was sucked out[17] as it were. The All-gods called upon[18] him with this (Sāman, i.e. with its Stobha) *oho iyā*[19]. Then Indra returned to the third pressing and he did not run away from it anymore. Therefore this Sāman is associated with Indra. His sacrifice becomes visited by Indra and by the gods, Indra turns to his sacrifice and does not run away from his sacrifice, if he knows thus.

It has the Svarita tone on its last vowel. Tone is breath[20]. They become deprived of their life (breaths) as it were, who neglect something of their sacrificial work, if at all[21] (it is possible to say of people that) they neglect something. For who knows whether one omits something or not[21]. In that (this Sāman) has the tone on its last vowel, thereby they become provided with the lifebreaths.

I. 3. 1. 6. *The Āndhīgava Sāman* (165)

Auswahl, 63–64 and Caland's transl. in notes on PB. 8, 5, 12
JB. 1, 339; PB. 8, 5, 12–13.

165. And now the Āndhīgava. It has a finale in the middle[1] for the

sake of having a firm ground to rest upon. They who undertake the Ārbhava Pavamāna sail out on a sea without a halting-place. That this Sāman has a finale in the middle is for the sake of a resting-point. Just as in daily life people sail out for the sea, find an island, sail towards it and remain there taking a rest, in the same way they may after striking upon this finale take a rest, if they like, and stop praising for a while.

It has the word *iḷā* as its finale. The *iḷā* means cattle, cattle means all food. He who sets out for a journey without victuals does not accomplish it. But he who starts with victuals accomplishes it.

Forsooth this intermediate space is a sea without a halting-place. Without stores one cannot go over this in whatsoever way. Therefore they make here all food in the form of cattle their stores and go.

The Śāktyas who were longing for food performed the consecration. Now Andhīgu Śāktya saw this Sāman. He praised with it. He applied this tensyllabled Virāj in its middle (as a finale)[2]. The Virāj metre is tensyllabled, the Virāj is food. Thereupon they obtained food. Therefore this Sāman means the obtaining of the Virāj, of food. He who knows this obtains the Virāj, obtains food, becomes an eater of food and the best amongst his own people. And because Andhīgu Śāktya saw it, therefore it is called the Āndhīgava.

I. 3. 1. 7. *The Kāva Sāman (the last of the Ārbhava Pavamāna) and its relation to the Aušana (the last of the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna). The parallelism of the midday service and the afternoon service* (166–167)

Auswahl, 64–65
JB. 1, 339; PB. 8, 5, 14–16.

166. Then there are the verses "Made favourable he blows wind into the dear ones"[1]. Prajāpati created the creatures. He created them without breath. By means of these verses he gave them breath: "Made favourable he blows wind into the dear ones". Offspring is something dear. He blowed on (or into) them with breath as appears from *abhi* in the verse[2]. "The names which the young one has while he grows". Names means great offspring[3]. "The lofty one has mounted the chariot of the lofty sun, which goes into two directions, he who looks around". The breath goes into two directions[4]. It moves to and fro. These verses procure life. Praising with these verses one reaches a complete lifetime.

On these the Kāva (is chanted). Kavi, the descendant of Bhṛgu, wished to go to the immortal world of the Gandharvas among the gods. He saw this Sāman. He praised with it. Thereupon he reached the immortal world of the Gandharvas among the gods. Therefore this Sāman procures a world (in heaven). Praising with this Sāman one

reaches the immortal world of the Gandharvas among the gods. And because Kavi, the descendant of Bhṛgu, saw this therefore it is called Kāva.

[5]It is provided with a particular tone (at the end). By means of a sound (or tone) at the end (of the mantra) food is given to the gods. It becomes identical with the Ṛc (in its Sāman-ending) at the end of the Pavamāna. They take care that the Sāman does not exceed the (last syllable of the) Ṛc and the Ṛc the (last syllable of the) Sāman. The fact that here and there in the Pavamāna they do not chant (words from the Ṛc) is (done) for the sake of equality (between Sāman and Ṛc), for the balance in the arrangement. At the beginning (of the Pavamāna) the Gāyatra Sāman has the 'circumflected' *padānusvara* ending, at the end, at the conclusion of the Pavamāna (the Kāva) has the 'circumflected' *padānusvara* ending. Therefore the creatures have airs in two directions, upwards and downwards[5].

The boat forsooth which father and son together punt[6] is not wrecked. Sacrifice is a divine (i.e. metaphorical)[7] boat. Father and son punt it. The Auśana stands at the beginning and the Kāva at the end, in order that the sacrifice is not wrecked. Therefore, when people mount a boat in a hurry[8] father and son mount first.

These are the metres in the Ārbhava Pavamāna and the seven chants. That amounts to twelve. The year consists of twelve months[9]. On the other hand those five Sāmans of the midday-pressing are seasons. The months belong to the Ārbhava Pavamāna, the seasons to the Midday Pavamāna. The sacrifice is arranged as a year.

167. Prajāpati forsooth is the year. During six months he keeps standing with the one or the other foot raised. When he raises his warm foot, then it becomes warm here above and cold below. Therefore in the summer heat is found above and cold below. Therefore also in the summer they draw cold water from a well. And when he raises his cold (foot) then it is cold here above and warm below. Therefore in the winter cold is found above and heat below. Therefore also in the winter they draw warm water from a well. In this way Prajāpati here in the form of the year supports the creatures.

I. 3. 2. *The rice mess to Soma (saumya caru)* (167–168)

CH, 362–366; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 758–764; II, 1 (S.S.) 447–449; Staal, *Agni*, I, 650; *Auswahl*, 65–66.

PB. 1, 5, 17–18; ṢaḍvB. 1, 7; TS. 6, 6, 7, 1–2; JŚS. 1, 19; LŚS. 2, 10, 6–14; DŚS. 6, 2, 6–14.

167. (continued). Then they offer this rice mess to Soma. That which the Udgātṛs do too much or too little, that becomes lost and goes to the

world of Yama. This is also said by people who have risen from death: "We have seen this in the hall of Yama". They thereby fetch it back in that they offer this rice mess.[1] He should look at it (reciting): "My mind that has gone to Yama or has not gone away (that far) that we put again into ourselves through King Soma". "In my mind you have placed the sight, in the sight my mind". "May I not become cut off from the verses which bestow long life; may I not become separated from my portion of the Sāman". Then he should also look down at his reflection in order that his soul does not become lost[2].

And he should apply something of the butter[3] on his eyes in order to improve his sight. Let then there also be[4] discernment. He who does not see himself has lost his soul[5]. For that reason also he should pour some more butter on it and try to see himself, in order to obtain a full lifetime.

168. [6]When the Aṅgirases were holding a sacrificial session, sand got into their eyes. They wished: "May we lose our blindness, may we see". They[7] put this dark-coloured mess for Soma on their eyes. They applied it with this verse: "The sight through which the men-watching won the contest, through which he overcame the well-winged bird of prey, the falcon, the boundless sight which they say is in Aditi, let the men-watching Soma put that in me"[8]. Then they lost their blindness and they began to see. He who knows thus loses his blindness and begins to see.

Now they say: "Is it to be eaten or not?" He who having studied has no fame and is afflicted, may eat it. They who have studied here are qualified to receive fame. The fame of someone who having studied has no fame and is afflicted, has gone to yonder world. It is thereby fetched back again in that he eats this dark-coloured mess for Soma. As to this Śāṭyāyani said: "It should not be eaten. Who would take away fame from the place where he intends to stay several nights?"[9].

I. 3. 3. *The Agniṣṭoma* (169–178)

CH, 368–371; *Śrautakośa* II, 2 (E.S.), 454–456; II, 1 (S.S.), 453–456; Staal, *Pratidānam*, 427–429; *Agni* I, 651–654; *Auswahl*, 66–69.
JB. 1, 340; PB. 8, 6–7; JŚS. 1, 19; LŚS. 2, 10, 15–24; DŚS. 6, 2, 15—6, 3, 3.

I. 3. 3. 1. *The Yajñāyajñīya Sāman* (169–170)

169. *yajñāyajñā vo agnaye*[1]. This is the fourth part of the Sāman. Thereby he gives the sacrifice a firm foothold in the Sāman. This is the self[2] of the Sāmans. Thereby they give the Sāmans a self. He who might dissociate himself from this Sāman, might become leprous or a bad rumour might harrass him.

This Gāyatrī having become a bird (*vayas*) rose up. He flew to

heaven. To him[3] when he was in the Anuṣṭubh, the quarters of space gave their taxes[4]. For him who knows thus the subjects become tax-paying[5], tribute is made to him from every quarter of space.

He sings as Prastāva *vayo yajñā vo agnaye*, (as Udgītha) *o yirā yirā ca dakṣase poprim vayam amṛtam jātovāhoyi* and as Pratihāra *vidosam*[6]. *yajña* is two syllables, *gira* is two and *poprim* is two. This amounts to six. The silent recitation consists of six syllables. Thereby the silent recitation in the litany for Agni and the Maruts is stopped[7]. For this is the end.

Agni Vaiśvānara rose in order to attack the creatures. He heated all this. The gods became afraid of this heat. They said: "He will burn all this.—

170. — Let us remove his fury"[8]. They removed his fury. When they first removed the fury, they became engaged in a discussion on this subject: "Where will it be?" They said: "It will be in every sacrifice (*yajñe yajñe*) of us". Then it became the *yajñāyajñīyam*. Therefore the Yajñāyajñīya is called the Yajñāyajñīya.

When they removed it the second time, it became the Nārmedha. When they removed it the third time, it became the Dāśaspatya. When they removed it the fourth time, then it became the Viśoviśīya. When they removed it the fifth time, it became the Vāravantīya.

The sacrifice is Agni Vaiśvānara. Likewise these Sāmans of the Agniṣṭoma are (Agni Vaiśvānara). Thereby he firmly establishes Agni Vaiśvānara in blazing fury[9].

I. 3. 3. 2. *Other optional Sāmans* (171–172)

Auswahl, 66–67; Caland's n. 3 on PB. 8, 8, 22.

171. He who seeks help should apply (instead of the Yajñāyajñīya) the Nārmedha Sāman. Nṛmedha and Suvrata were two brothers. They established the sacred fires[1]. Nṛmedha acted as the Udgātṛ for Suvrata. The Yajñāyajñīya still was not chanted when they came running towards him saying: "The two sons of the Udgātṛ, Nakira and Śakapūta, have killed Antakadhṛti Sauvrata[2], the son of you who are his Yajamāna[3]". Seizing both his arms he said: "O Brahmins, this sacrifice is yours (now)[4]. You may perform it for whomever you wish as your Yajamāna. But I will forsooth take revenges[5] for it through this man". Having bound him to the pillar of Udumbara he set fire on him by means of hempen chips. He (Nṛmedha) desired: "May I get out of this; may I find a way out and help, may this fire not burn me." He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Thereupon he found a way out and help, and the fire did not burn him; it even burned down the cord with which he was bound. Therefore this Sāman procures a way out and help. For he found a way

out and help. He who knows thus finds a way out and help. And because Nṛmedha saw it, therefore it is called Nārmedha.

172. He should apply the Dāśaspatya (instead) in case he desires pre-eminence. The Gods and Asuras were at strife. The gods ran to Indra (and said) "Let us win here with you as commander". Indra desired: "May we conquer the Asuras". He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Thereupon the gods conquered the Asuras. After he had become the victor they offered him the first choice (out of every ten pieces of booty)[6] saying "*daśapataye dasápataya* (for the lord of ten) *ā*" Therefore the Dāśaspatya is called the Dāśaspatya. He who knows thus has the first choice and has to be honoured (*uddhārya*).

He who desires food should apply the Viśoviśīya. Agni desired: "May I become an eater of food[7], the most eminent one and the overlord in every tribe[8]. He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Thereupon he became an 'eater of food', the most eminent one and the overlord in every tribe. Thereupon they employed him (Agni = the sacred fire) in every tribe. Because they employed him (or: it) in every tribe (*viśoviśo*), therefore the Viśoviśīya is called the Viśoviśīya. He (Agni) is an eater of food, the most eminent and the overlord in every tribe. He who knows thus becomes an 'eater of food', the most eminent and the overlord in every tribe.

He who desires cattle should apply the Vāravantīya Sāman. Prajāpati created the animals. Having been created they ran away from him. By means of the Vāravantīya Sāman he held them back. Because he held them back (*avārayat*) therefore the Vāravantīya is called the Vāravantīya. The application of the Vāravantīya as the Agniṣṭoma Sāman is made in order that the animals remain present[9] and do not run away.

I. 3. 3. 3. *The Yajñāyajñīya, its name and function* (173)

JB. 1, 340; PB. 8, 6, 1–4.

173. [1]He who knows the udder of the sacrifice milks a sacrifice which is flowing abundantly. The Yajñāyajñīya forsooth is the udder of the sacrifice. It has the following teats: Gāyatra, Rathantara, Bṛhat and Vāmadevya. Therefore he should use the Gāyatra as it were when he sings the Prastāva and he should use the Stobhas of the Rathantara as it were and the raisings of the Bṛhat. The Hiṅkara is the Vāmadevya and it is the Yajñāyajñīya itself. This sacrifice the Yajamāna milks. Having sacrificed he becomes prosperous[1]. (The Prastāva) is *yajñāyajñā vo agnaye*[2]. The Yajñāyajñīya is every sacrifice (*yajño yajño*). Because it conducts every sacrifice (*yajñaṃ yajñam*) to the gods, therefore the

Yajñāyajñīya is called Yajñāyajñīya. Formerly they used to hold all the lauds with this (Sāman).

Now they say[3]: "They who sacrifice go upwards to heaven. They run the risk of going away beyond the point of return". Therefore they hold the laud with the Yajñāyajñīya at the end. The Yajñāyajñīya is this world. Thereby they get a firm hold in this world[4].

I. 3. 3. 4. *Water is poured between the naked thighs of the wife of the sacrificer and the Udgātṛ looks at her* (173–174)

Caland's n. 2 on PB. 8, 7, 11; n. 4 on ĀpŚS. 13, 15. 9.
PB. 8, 7, 8–14; TS. 6, 5, 8, 6.

173 (continued). —They praise having placed (a vessel filled with) water in the nearness—the Yajñāyajñīya forsooth is Agni Vaiśvānara—in order to extinguish it and not to be burnt by it. The wife (of the sacrificer) throws it down between her thighs. Thereby she extinguishes Agni Vaiśvānara. She throws it down after having made her thigh rather[1] naked. For having made the thigh rather naked the wife arouses the virility (of the husband)[2]. They cause her to be looked at (by the Udgātṛ)[3] for the sake of impregnation. As to this they say: "The wife[4] thereby conceives offspring from the Udgātṛ when they make (him) look at her when there is a break in the chanting of the Sāman"[5].

174. He should look at her (with the Yajus): "You are desirable indeed, in your appearance may we obtain everything which is desirable"[6]. Offspring is something desirable. Thereby he places offspring in himself. The other (the wife of the sacrificer) looks (at him with the Yajus). "From you who are a man possessing manly power may we obtain all the seed"[6].

I. 3. 3. 5. *Should the Udgātṛ cover his head?* (174)

Caland's n. 1 on PB. 8, 7, 7.
PB. 8, 7, 7.

174. (continued) —Now they say: "He should sing the Udgītha being covered—the Yajñāyajñīya is Agni Vaiśvānara—in order to extinguish it and not to be burnt by it". But when he sings being covered, he runs the risk of having the Pitṛs as his deities. They also say that he should sing being covered up to the ears. As to this however they also say: "By means of the ears he hears, by means of the eyes he sees. He would deprive himself of (all) this, if he should chant being covered. Moreover they pour down milk to be mixed with Soma in the third pressing[1]. The milk for the mixture means progeny and cattle. From all this he would

deprive himself if[2] he should sing being covered (completely). He should sing being uncovered".

I. 3. 3. 6. *Variations in the text of the Yajñāyajñīya* (175–177)

Auswahl, 67–69; Caland's n. 2 on PB. 8, 6, 10; Oertel, *SBAW* 1942 (8), 35–40.
PB. 8, 6, 8–12

175. The Yajñāyajñīya is a bird. If he should desire about a sacrificer: "May he obtain heaven as his (future) world" he should sing for him the Prastāva with the words *vayo* ("bird") *yajñā vo agnaye*[1]. Having become a bird it carries him to heaven. On the other hand it thereby become so to say not conductive to a safe and complete lifetime (for the sacrificer). A bird is something which is rather dragged away[2], it is as it were something of no fixed abode. Therefore he should not sing the Prastāva in this way.

(Instead of *girā girā ca dākṣāsā* he should sing) *o yirā yirā cā dākṣāsā*[3]. When he should say *girā girā ca*[4] Agni Vaiśvānara would swallow (*giret*) the sacrificer. And by saying *o yirā yirā cā dākṣāsā*—the *irā* is food—he places food at the opening (= mouth/beginning) of Agni Vaiśvanara (= the Yajñāyajñīya). However, he runs the risk of becoming emaciated when he should say *o yirā yirā cā dākṣāsā*[5]. He should say: *o yirā ihā cā dākṣāsā*.

176. Thus he does not become emaciated.

As to this the Brahmins of the past used to speculate: "Who, forsooth, will jump[6] past the opened mouth of the crocodile?" The Yajñāyajñīya is a female crocodile[7] who remains waiting with an opened mouth against the stream in a bottleneck. Having placed food in her mouth he safely passes.

(Instead of *pra pra vayam amṛtaṃ jātā* he says) *popriṃ vayam amṛtaṃ jāto vā*. If he should say *pra pra vayam* ("away, away with us"), the sacrificer would prematurely die. But when he says *poprim*, he (Agni) becomes liberal[8] for him.

(He says) *hiṃ māyi dāyivam*. If he were to say *dāsam*[9] the sacrificer would become decaying[10]. But by saying *dāyivam*—they say that the sacrifice of which (all) the lauds have been performed should be transferred to heaven—thereby they transfer the sacrifice of which all the lauds have been performed to heaven (*divam*)[11].

(He says) *priyaṃ mitraṃ nū śaṃsiṣam*. If he should say *priyaṃ mitraṃ na śaṃsiṣam* he would not[12] praise his dearest friend. But by saying *priyaṃ mitraṃ nu śaṃsiṣam* he praises his dearest friend.

177. (He says) *prāyāṃ māyitrān nū śāṃsīṣām ūrjo napātaṃ sa hy āyumā*[13]. If he should say *nāyumā*[14], the sacrificer would not have a long

lifetime (*āyus*). But by saying *āyumā* thereby the Udgātṛ places a long lifetime in himself and in the sacrificer.

(He says) *hiṃ māyāsmāyūḥ āśemā havyadātāyā u vā*[15]. If he should say *dāśema* they would bite (*daṃśuka*) him. But by saying *āśemā* he reaches (something).

(He says) *āśemā hāvyā dātāyāyi bhuvād vājeṣv avitā bhūvād dhiṃ māyi vārdhā*. Then his sacrifice becomes rather prosperous (*vṛddha*).

(He says) *ut trātā bahūnām*. If he should say *tanūnām*, the sacrificer would become rather thin (*tanu*). But by saying *bahūnām* thereby he makes him the saviour of many (*bahūnām*).

I. 3. 3. 7. *The finale of the last Stotriya and the unyoking of the metres* (178)

Auswahl, 68–69; Caland's n. 3 on PB. 8, 6, 13
PB. 8, 6, 13–14.

178. Now they say: "The verses of the Yajñāyajñīya miss one syllable[1]. That is a gap in the Yajñāyajñīya. If he should not cover this gap in his chant he would make the Yajñāyajñīya leaky. After the Yajñāyajñīya has become leaky the sacrifices leaks, after the sacrifice the sacrificer, after the sacrificer the offspring. He should place the word *vāc* ("word") in (that gap)—*vāc* is Brahman—in the following way: *uta trātā vāg bahūnā u vā*. Some place (there the word) cow—the cow is complete food—in order to obtain complete food. On the other hand they say: "One should not pay attention to this. Everything is already healed by the fact that this (Sāman) has as its finale the word *vāc*[2]."

Now they say: "The metres should be unyoked in due order according to their seniority, in view of the rule 'The creatures are arranged according to arrangement and the unyoking of the metres'". He makes a Prastāva consisting of the six syllables *yajñā vo agnaye*. With the six syllables *girā ca dakṣase* he undertakes the Ādi (beginning). That amounts to twelve syllables. The Jagatī metre consists of twelve syllables. They heap together the Jagatī at the beginning. Thereby they become freed from the Jagatī. (The words) *pra vayam amṛtaṃ jātavedasaṁ* amount to eleven syllables. The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables. Thereby they become freed from the Triṣṭubh. With the eight syllables *priyaṃ mitraṃ nu śaṃsiṣam* they undertake the end of the Sāman. The Gāyatrī has eight syllables. Thereby they become freed from the Gāyatrī. In this way the metres become unyoked in due order and according to their seniority. In accordance with the arrangement and the unyoking of the metres the creatures become arranged. No one is dying before (his time) who is destined to die later.

II. THE UKTHYA (179–191)

Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 137; Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, 334–335; Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaśāstra*, II, 2, 1204; Staal, *Agni*, I, 655–658

II. 1. *The three Uktha lauds in general* (179–181)

Caland, *Auswahl*, 69–72
PB. 8, 8, 1–8

179. The gods and the Asuras were fighting for the sacrifice. The gods drove the Asuras out of the sacrifice. The Asuras snatched away the sap and power of all the three pressings and entered the blind darkness. Everything which is beyond the Agniṣṭoma is blind darkness; what is beyond the year is blind darkness. The sacrifice forsooth is as great as the Agniṣṭoma; even great is also the year. There are twelve Stotras in the Agniṣṭoma, there are twelve months in a year. There are twelve Stotras and twelve Śastras. There are twelve halfmonths in the first and twelve in the second halves of the months. And everything which is beyond, that is blind darkness. That they entered. The gods followed the Asuras. They went to meet (*pratyudatiṣṭhan*) them with the Ukthas; therefore the Ukthas are called Ukthas (= *utthas*). Thereupon they threw them out. They entered blind darkness, (i.e.) the night.

Indra said: "Who will follow them together with me?"

180. "I" said Varuṇa. "I will support the light (*jyotis*)" said Agni. Both of them followed them. The two of them took one third. Thereby they caused the morning pressing to increase. Therefore they praise on verses dedicated to Agni[1] and the corresponding recitation is dedicated to Indra and Varuṇa. Therefore they praise on Gāyatrī verses. For the morning pressing is connected with the Gāyatrī metre. He (Indra) said: "Who will together with me follow them?" "I" said Bṛhaspati. Both of them followed. The two of them took out one third. Thereby they caused the midday pressing to increase. Therefore they praise on verses dedicated to Indra[2] and the corresponding recitation is dedicated to Indra and Bṛhaspati. Therefore also they praise on verses written in the Kakubh metre. For the midday pressing is connected with the Kakubh metre[3]. He (Indra) said: "Who will follow them together with me?". "I" said Viṣṇu. Both of them followed them. The two of them took one third. Thereby they caused the third pressing to increase. Therefore they praise on verses dedicated to Indra[4] and the corresponding reci-

tation is dedicated to Indra and Viṣṇu. Therefore they praise on Anuṣṭubh verses[5]. For the third pressing is connected with the Anuṣṭubh[6].

They excluded them (the Asuras) from everything. And from that time people lead (the Jyotiṣṭoma) further (from the Agniṣṭoma) towards this (Ukthya)[7]. They lead forwards from the (Yajñāyajñīya) verses containing the word *ehi*[8].

181. All these three (Ukthas) concern two deities: Indra and Varuṇa, Indra and Bṛhaspati, Indra and Viṣṇu. By so much (i.e. by these six) they (the gods) took away the six wishcows (from the Asuras): the cow, the horse, the goat, the sheep, the rice and the barley. For him who knows thus these six wishcows become subservient[9].

The sacrifice forsooth is as great as the Agniṣṭoma. Now they say: "If the sacrifice is as great as the Agniṣṭoma, why do they lead (the sacrifice) further towards the Ukthas[10] when this (Agniṣṭoma) has reached its end[11]?" He should say: "The verses of the Yajñāyajñīya miss one syllable. That is the cleft of the sacrifice[12]. Thereby he makes the sacrifice whole on this spot."

They lead further from verses dedicated to Agni to verses dedicated to Agni[13]. This is like putting fires upon fire. If someone should distribute one fire manifoldly there would be many (fires). And if one should take these many together there would be one. It is like putting fires on one fire.

II. 2. *The first Uktha Stotra; the Sākamaśva Sāman and variations for special purposes.* (182)

Auswahl, 72–74
PB. 8, 8, 4–5; 9, 2, 8–9; 12, 6, 5–6; 12, 9, 20–22

182. On these verses[1] the Sākamaśva (is sung). The gods desirous of heaven practised austerities. They saw this Sāman. They praised with it. Having become a horse it carried them to heaven. After they had come to heaven they said: "Together with (*sākam*) the horse (*aśva*) we have come to heaven." Therefore the Sākamaśva is called Sākamaśva. Therefore this Sāman is one which leads to heaven. He who knows thus reaches heaven.

For someone who has a rival he should apply the Pramaṃhiṣṭhīya Sāman (in the first Ukthastotra). Indra raised the Vajra (in order to hurl it) at Vṛtra. He could not hit him[2]. When he saw (the syllable) *pra*[3], then he killed him. He who knows thus kills his hating rival. And because he saw (the syllable) *pra*, therefore it is called the Pramaṃhiṣṭhīya Sāman.

For him who has only partly conquered[4] the Satrāsāhīya Sāman[5] should be applied (in the first Ukthastotra). Indra overcame the Asuras.

Some of them he did not overcome. He desired: "May I finally subdue all the Asuras". He saw this Sāman. He praised with it. He finally overcame all the Asuras with it. And because he overcame (*asahata*) the Asuras finally (*satrā*), therefore the Satrāsāhīya Sāman is called Satrāsāhīya. He who knows thus finally overcomes his hating rival.

For him who desires to become a Purohita he should apply the Daivodāsa Sāman (in the first Ukthastotra). The Brahmin is consecrated to Agni, the Kṣatriya to Indra. This Sāman is consecrated to Agni and Indra[6]. Agni is the class of the Brahmins, Indra the class of the Kṣatriyas. Thereby he supports the Kṣatriya class by means of the Brahmin class and the Brahmin class by means of the Kṣatriya class. In this way the authority over the people does not get lost from him. He reaches the position of a Purohita, they give him a prominent position (as a Purohita)[7].

II. 3. *The second Uktha Stotra; the Saubhara Sāman and other optional chants* (183–187)

Oertel, *JAOS* 18 (1897), 19–20; 19 (1898), 123–125; *Auswahl*, 74–76; Caland's n. 1 on PB. 8, 8, 16; Ghosh, *Fragments*, 19–21; K. Hoffmann, *IIJ* 4 (1960), 8–10; Bodewitz, *Amṛtadhārā. Dandekar Felic. Vol.*, Delhi, 1984, 65–72; O' Flaherty, *Tales of sex*, 53 f.

PB. 8, 1, 4–5; 8, 8, 13–20; 8, 9, 1–5; 12, 4, 17; 14, 11, 21–23

183. For him who is possessed of a demon he should apply the Harivarṇa[1] as the Brahmasāman (i.e. in the second Uktha Stotra)[2]. When the Aṅgiras went to heaven from these worlds the demons (Rakṣas) followed them. They wished: "May we strike away the demons"[2]. Then the Aṅgiras Harivarṇa saw this Sāman. He praised with it. Thereby they struck away[3] the demons from these worlds, by (the finale) *hariśriyam* from the earth, by *virājasi* from the intermediate space, by *dive dive* from heaven. Thereupon after having struck away the demons from all these worlds they rose to heaven. He who knows thus rises to heaven after having struck away the demons from all these worlds.

184. He who desires help should apply the Traita Sāman[4] (in the second Uktha Stotra). When the Āptyas were on their way with what they had earned (as Dakṣiṇās?)[5], they got thirsty in the desert. They found a well in the waste land[6]. Then neither Ekata nor Dvita was willing to descend. Then Trita descended. When these two had drunk and become satisfied, then[7] they covered him (Trita) when he was (still) in the same place (i.e. in the well) with a wheel and went away with the cattle[8]. He desired: "May I come out of this; may I find help and protection"[9]. He saw this Sāman and praised with it. He used the finale *sam indubhiḥ* ("with drops"). By means of a rainshower Parjanya

floated him upwards and out (of the well), for he floated him upwards towards the wheel with which he was covered. Therefore this is a Sāman which procures a way out and assistance. He who knows thus finds a way out and assistance.

He followed (them) along the track. When they saw him coming they jumped to the wood, the one having become a bear, the other an ape. This is also a Sāman which slays rivals. For these two whom he had turned into a bear and an ape had become his rivals.

Moreover Parjanya rains for him.

It is also a Sāman which procures cattle. For he made these cows exclusively his. He who knows thus obtains cattle and becomes possessed of much cattle.

And because Trita Āptya saw it, therefore it is called Traita.

185. He who desires food should apply the Traikakubha Sāman[10] Indra gave the Yatis to the wolves[11]. When they were being eaten, three boys were left: Rayovāja, Pṛthuraśmi and Bṛhadgiri. They praised Indra. To them he said: "Wishing what, O boys, do you praise me[12]?" They said: "Support us, O bounteous one". He threw them on his back[13]. They[14] clung[15] to his three well-known humps.

These worlds which had been together separated in three parts. Food threefoldly followed them[16]. And to the three 'humps' of these three worlds was also clinging something namely food[17].

He (Indra) considered: "If I should[18] obtain the three 'humps' of these three worlds (and) the food, I could thereby throw away these humps of mine". He saw this Sāman and praised with it. Thereby he obtained the three 'humps' of these three worlds (and) the food. Therefore the Traikakubha ("three-humped") is called Traikakubha. Therefore this Sāman means the obtainment of food. He who knows thus obtains food[19], becomes an eater of food and the most powerful amongst his own people.

186. This (Traikakubha) Sāman is connected with three vital powers (*indriyas*) (or: threefoldly connected with Indra's qualities)[20]. The triplet (on which this Sāman is chanted) is dedicated to Indra. The Sāman (itself or rather its name) is connected with Indra (and his three *kakubhs*). Its finale is *indraḥ*. There are three vital powers (*indriyas*) in man: oneself, offspring and cattle. These he thereby encompasses within himself.

He (Indra) said to them (the three Yatis): "What does the one wish, what the other, what the third?" Rayovāja said: "I desire cattle". He gave to him the *iḷā*. The *iḷā* is cattle[21]. Then Pṛthuraśmi said: "I desire royal power[22]". He gave to him royal power[22]. He is (the same as) Pṛthu Vainyu[23]. Then Bṛhadgiri said: "I desire food"[24]. To him also[25] he gave what he desired.

He who desires offspring should apply the Saubhara Sāman (in the second Uktha Stotra). He should adopt *hus* as finale. He who desires food should apply the Saubhara. He should adopt *ūrk* ("food") as finale. He who desires rain should apply the Saubhara. He should adopt *his*[26] as finale. He who desires that the rain may stop (*udgrahaṇakāma*) should apply the Saubhara Sāman. He should adopt *ud* as finale. He who desires to go to heaven should apply the Saubhara Sāman. He should adopt *ū* as finale[27].

They asked the descendants of Bharadvāja, when they were performing a long sacrificial session: "With what (Sāman) did you praise, when you desired offspring?" "With the Saubhara". "With what, when you desired food?" "With the Saubhara". "With what when you desired that the rains should stop?" "With the Saubhara". "With what, when you desired to go to heaven?" "With the Saubhara". Such so to say is this Sāman. These are the wishes connected with it. These wishes he obtains. Whatever one desires, when one praises with this Sāman, that wish becomes fulfilled for him.

187. He who may wish: "May there be born an excellent ruler[28], an excellent man, of good appearance and good-looking, in my offspring", should make the Saubhara the Brahmasāman (i.e. the Sāman of the second Uktha Stotra). The lustre of man is his offspring; the Saubhara is the lustre of the Bṛhat. The Bṛhat is nobility[29]. This (Saubhara chant) is also the offspring of a member of the nobility. In the offspring of him who knows thus an excellent ruler, an excellent man, of good appearance and good looking, is born.

Prajāpati created the creatures. These being created by him perished. They became the reptiles other than the snakes. He created a second group of creatures. They also perished. They became the fishes. He created a third group of creatures. They also perished. They became the birds. He created a fourth group of creatures. He thought: "How might these creatures not perish?" He saw this Sāman. By means of it he touched them, when he pronounced (the finale) *ūrj* ("food"). Having been anointed by him with *ūrj* they throve. He said: "I have nourished them well (*subhṛtaṃ bhṛ*)[30]. Therefore the Saubhara is called Saubhara. He who knows thus nourishes his offspring well[31].

II. 4. *The third Uktha Stotra; the Nārmedha Sāman and other, optional chants* (188–191)

Auswahl, 76–77; Caland's n. 1 on PB. 8, 8, 25; n. 4 on 8, 8, 26
PB. 8, 8, 21–26; 8, 9, 6–22

188. They praise with the Nārmedha (the third Uktha Stotra, the Stotra) for the Acchāvāka in the Atirātra. With the *iḷā* (of this last chant

of the Ukthya) they make a transition to the night (i.e. to the Atirātra, in case no Ṣoḍaśin is performed)[1]. Now they say: "They who perform the Acchāvāka's chant on Uṣṇih verses, lose the Anuṣṭubh". One of these (Uṣṇih verses: ṚV. 8, 98, 7–9) is an Arvāg-Uṣṇih, one a Madhya-Uṣṇih, one a Pura-Uṣṇih[2]. The metre (of these verses) is free[3]; speech speaks freely. The Anuṣṭubh is speech[4]. Thereby they do not lose the Anuṣṭubh. The last of these (verses) is an obvious Anuṣṭubh[5]. Thereby also indeed they do not lose the Anuṣṭubh. Just like here in this world the bees gather the essences of the blossoms, in the same way these deities gathered the essences of the metres[6]. By him who knows thus there is praised with the essence of the metres.

This Sāman has the features of night and day. The verses belong to Indra, the Sāman belongs to Agni[7]. The day belongs to Indra, the night to Agni. If one should miss this Sāman (and use an other) in the Atirātra, one would tear away oneself from the representation of night and day. If someone were to say about him on this occasion: "He (the priest) has torn him (the sacrificer) away from the representations of night and day", this would come true. Therefore this Sāman should not be left out in the Atirātra.

189. Forsooth, the night goes more quickly than the day. The *iḷā*[8] is *ehi* ("come"), in order not to tear off (the night, i.e. the Atirātra, from the day, i.e. the Agniṣṭoma + Ukthya).

What was the excellence of the Ṛc and of the Sāman, that became the Udvaṃśīya[9]. He who knows thus becomes firmly established by Ṛc and Sāman. He should apply this (Sāman) for a noble man, not for a vile man[10]—the vile man has a moderate, the noble man an abundant living—in order to obtain the abundancy. Moreover, the gods raised their race as it were, when they overpowered the Asuras. Because they raised (*udyatya*) their race (*vaṃśa*) upwards (*ud*) with this chant, when they overpowered the Asuras, therefore this (chant) became the Udvaṃśīya. This is the reason why the Udvaṃśīya is called Udvaṃśīya. He who knows thus conquers the unconquered and does not suffer the loss of what he had conquered already.

This chant[11] is a representation of all the Pṛṣṭha Sāmans. The words *gāyanti tvā gāyatriṇaḥ* are a representation of the Gāyatra; *arcanty arkam arkāviṇā* of the Rathantara[12]; *brahmāṇas tvā hoyi śatakratāv* of the Bṛhat[13]; *ud vaṃśam, iva yāyimirāyi* of the Vairūpa[14]; the repetition[15] *ud vaṃśāmi* (forms a representation) of the Vairāja; *vā yā vu vā up*[16] of the Mahānāmnīs; *mā*[17] *irā* of the Revatīs[18]; *hā i* of the Vāmadevya[19]. Thereby one becomes firmly established in every manifestation of the Pṛṣṭhas[20], in their essence, in their unsurpassed lustre and their metres, at the end of the (Ukthya) sacrifice.

190. He who is connected with something consisting of sixteen parts is complete[21], forsooth. In case the Udvaṃśīya is applied (as the Sāman

of the third Ukthya Stotra, i.e. as the fifteenth Stotra), one repeats again the last quarter (*ud vaṃśam iva yemire* three times)[22]. By this a Ṣoḍaśin is produced as to its outward appearance. The Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra[23] to be used against a rival. Thereby one hurls a Vajra at one's hating rival, in order to lay him down.

There was darkness between the gods and the Asuras. The gods saw this half-*iḷā*[24]. Thereby they traversed that (darkness)[25]. One should concentrate one's thought on someone whom one hates. Using (?) this half-*iḷā* one transpierces[26] him. One applies an *atisvara*[27] in the half-*iḷā*. Therefore[28] flow through.

Asāḍha, the son of Savayasa, performed an Atirātra sacrifice. Then Atidhanva Śaunaka was a *prasarpaka*[29]. He (i.e. Asāḍha) applied the Udvaṃśīya as the Acchāvāka Sāman (i.e. as the Sāman of the third Ukthya Stotra) at the Atirātra. To him he (i.e. Atidhanva) said: "You people should make this in such a way. With a broken off *iḷā*[30] the sound loses its firm grip in its relation to others. This is a manifestation of that which characterizes a servant[31]". He (Atidhanva) said: "We apply the complete *iḷā*, make a continuity by means of the tone[32] and then will move (from the day, i.e. from Ukthya) to the night (i.e. to the Atirātra)." "No" said the other (i.e. Asāḍha) "Indra, forsooth, pursued the Asuras with that Sāman. Having regained strength in the form of the tone (*svara*) they rushed against him. They conquered him. Having been conquered he hurled this half-*iḷā*. The half-*iḷā* is meant for protection".

191. "The Nārmedha should be applied. This (Sāman) has as its finale *iḷā*. The *iḷā* is cattle[33]. (Sacrificing) with cattle they (the gods) drove them[34] (the Asuras) out of the night. Therefore the Nārmedha should be applied"[35].

He[36] who desires prosperity should apply the two Āṣṭādaṃstra Sāmans. Aṣṭādaṃstra, the son of Virūpa, saw these two Sāmans later so to say than the other seers (saw their Sāmans). He feared: "My two Sāmans will be without Stotra verses"[37]. Then he said: "He who will let my two Sāmans[38] enjoy Soma[39] must become prosperous". These two Sāmans provide prosperity[40]. They who praise with these two obtain prosperity.

Aṣṭādaṃstra, the son of Virūpa, desiring cattle performed austerities. He saw these two Sāmans and praised with them. He applied this *iḷā* as its finale. The *iḷā* is cattle. Then he obtained cattle. These two Sāmans provide cattle. He who knows thus obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle. Because Aṣṭādaṃstra, the son of Virūpa, saw them, therefore these two are called Āṣṭādaṃstra.

This Sāman of the Acchāvāka has *iḷā* as its finale. The *iḷā* is cattle. Thereby one becomes firmly established in cattle.

III. THE ṢOḌAŚIN (192–205)

A. Weber, *Ind. Studien* 9 (1865), 120; 229; 10 (1868), 352; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 137; *Vedische Mythologie* III, Breslau 1902, 217–220; Keith, *Rel. and Phil.*, 335; Caland, *Auswahl*, 77–82; Staal, *Agni* I, 658–663.

TS. 6, 6, 11; AB. 4, 1–4; ŚāṅkhB. 17, 1–4; ŚB. 4, 5, 3; JB. 3, 80; PB. 12, 13; ṢaḍvB. 3, 11; JŚS. 1, 15; LŚS. 3, 1; DŚS. 7, 1

192. When Prajāpati assigned the colours to the gods, he reserved the yellow colour (*hari*) for himself[1]. He gave it to Indra[2]. Herewith Indra obtained superiority. They praise with verses containing the word *hari*[3], that is (his) superiority. Mysteriously the verses containing the word *hari* become Anuṣṭubhs[4]. When they are sung in the Stotra (i.e. with liturgical interpolations), they amount to thirty-four syllables. Then, by means of the two thirty-fourth syllables (i.e. by the thirty-third and the thirty-fourth) of the Sāman (additional) room is created, thus they say. If they should sing the laud on verses of thirty-five syllables, they would obtain a higher form, namely the one belonging to the Bṛhatī metre. If they should sing the laud on verses of thirty-three syllables, they would obtain a lower form, namely the one belonging to the Anuṣṭubh. If the Stoma should be fifteenfold, they would obtain the lowest form. When they sing the laud with a Ṣoḍaśin consisting of a sixteenfold Stoma sung on verses of thirty-four syllables, they make it prosper with regard to its own natural position[5]. On account of the fact that this (Ṣoḍaśin) becomes prosperous, prosperity is created for them among their own people[6].

There are sixteen Stotras and sixteen Śastras. That amounts to thirty-two. The Anuṣṭubh has thirty-two syllables. The Ṣoḍaśin is connected with the Anuṣṭubh, since it has a numeral correspondence to the Anuṣṭubh.

There were metres of the gods on the one hand and metres of the Asuras on the other.

193.[7]The monosyllabic metre was the lowest of the gods, the seven-syllabic the highest. The ninesyllabic was the lowest of the Asuras, the fifteensyllabic their highest. The gods desired: "May we take away the bigger one of the Asuras by means of the smaller". They took away the fifteensyllabic with the monosyllabic. With the bisyllabic they took away the fourteensyllabic with the threesyllabic the thirteensyllabic, with the foursyllabic the twelvesyllabic, with the fivesyllabic the elevensyllabic, with the sixsyllabic the tensyllabic with the sevensyllabic the ninesyllabic, with the eightsyllabic[8] the eight (syllables of the Asuras)[7]. Be-

cause every time these (syllables) amounted to sixteen (i.e. 1 + 15, 2 + 14 etc.), therefore the Ṣoḍaśin (the Sixteenfold) is called Ṣoḍaśin. To this the Gāyatrī was added (or: corresponded) as seventeenth[9]. Therefore they say: "Prajāpati is seventeenfold".

Indra[10] wished to slay Vṛtra. Saying (or: thinking) "I will slay Vṛtra" he resorted to Prajāpati. He (P.) gave to him this Ṣoḍaśin as a thunderbolt after having taken away its force[11], namely the Śakvarī verses. He (I.) could not slay him. He resorted again to him (P.) saying: "I really want to slay Vṛtra".

194. He (P.) gave to him the Śakvarī verses. Then Indra slayed Vṛtra. He who knows thus slays his hating rival.

He (P.) thought: "If I give (these verses) to him in the day-time, room will be left for the rivals in the night. If I give (them) to him during the night, room will be left for them during the day." Then he saw this, the moment during which the sun has just unharnessed the horses; at that moment he gave (them) to him[12]. Thereby he excluded the Asuras both from the night and from the day. He who knows thus excludes his hating rival from the night and from the day. Among the Stotras it is the Ṣoḍaśin which procures the attainment of heaven transferring as it were along a (narrow) channel[13]. He who knows thus reaches heaven.

195. Now they say: "A Trivṛt Stoma should be made". The Trivṛt is a thunderbolt[14]. The Ṣoḍaśin is a thunderbolt[15]. And they also say: "A fifteen-versed[16] Stoma should be made". The fifteen-versed Stoma is a thunderbolt[17]. ⟨The thunderbolt is the Ṣoḍaśin. And they also say: "A sixteen-versed Stoma should be made. The fifteen-versed is a thunderbolt⟩[18]. Indra, who raises the thunderbolt, is the sixteenth[19]. (He should do so thinking:) "May I slay the evil obstruction (Vṛtra), by means of a thunderbolt which is connected with Indra." By means of a thunderbolt which is connected with Indra he who knows thus slays the evil in the form of his hating rival. And they also say: "A seventeen-versed Stoma should be made". The fifteen-versed is a thunderbolt. Indra, who raises the thunderbolt, is the sixteenth. Prajāpati is the seventeenth. He is the one who undertakes the action, the protector, the one who speaks (to the executor): "Strike, kill, do not run away". (He should do so, i.e. make this Stoma, thinking:) "May I slay the evil, obstruction (Vṛtra), by means of a thunderbolt which is connected with Indra as well as with Prajāpati". He who knows thus slays the evil in the form of his hating rival by means of a thunderbolt which is connected with Indra as well as with Prajāpati. And they also say: "A twenty-one-versed Stoma should be made". Indra formed the thunderbolt out of all the seven Hotra(-functions)[20], three verses out of every Hotra. This twenty-one-versed Stoma became equal to the Ṣoḍaśin. Thereby Indra slayed Vṛtra. He who knows thus slays his hating rival.

As to this Yāmana Bhrātalāyana also said: "The Ṣoḍaśin produces a numeral concord[21] with the Virāj. The Ṣoḍaśin is connected with the Virāj. It is established in the Virāj. Whereever he may think that it corresponds to the Virāj, he should chant the laud with it.

196. The gods and the Asuras were fighting for night and day. The gods won the day, the Asuras resorted to the night. Then the gods said: "We have come into the possession of half this world. How could we also completely win the night? Let us attack (them)". They attacked. Then they stationed themselves[22] in the last part of the day and the Asuras came running from the night and stationed themselves in the first part of the night. The evening is the last part of the day, the evening is also the first part of the night. The one party stationed itself on its border, the other party stationed itself on its border. Their property were the metres. They were fighting for the metres.

197. [23]The monosyllabic metre was the lowest of the gods, the sevensyllabic the highest. The ninesyllabic was the lowest of the Asuras, the fifteensyllabic the highest. The sevensyllabic and the ninesyllabic were placed near each other, (i.e.) the metres of the one party were stationed turned in this direction[24], those of the other also in that direction[25]. Prajāpati having become of Anuṣṭubh-nature [26] came and stood between them. They (the gods and the Asuras) kept looking at each other and spying, wishing to find each other's weak place[27].

The gods resorted to Prajāpati saying: "We want to conquer the Asuras". To them he gave this thunderbolt, the Ṣoḍaśin, saying: "Having obtained their metres with your metres you must transfer[28] (the combinations of your own metres and those of the Asuras) to me (who am Anuṣṭubh-like)". They obtained the fifteensyllabic by means of the monosyllabic and the fourteensyllabic by means of the twosyllabic. This became an Anuṣṭubh. This they transferred to Prajāpati. By means of the threesyllabic they obtained the thirteensyllabic, by means of the foursyllabic the twelvesyllabic. This became an Anuṣṭubh. This they transferred to Prajāpati. By means of the fivesyllabic they obtained the elevensyllabic, by means of the sixsyllabic the tensyllabic. This became an Anuṣṭubh. This they transferred to Prajāpati. By means of the sevensyllabic they obtained the ninesyllabic, by means of the eightsyllabic the eight (syllables of the Asuras). This became an Anuṣṭubh. This they transferred to Prajāpati. Having obtained their metres with their own in this way[29] they struck out the Asuras. When they had become struck out and went to their holes, Prajāpati, having become a horse with redbrown colours, snorted them away (out of these holes)[30]. They are found spread (lit. one by one) among the people living outside the border[31] (of Aryan culture). Then the gods became

prosperous and the Asuras perished. He who knows thus becomes prosperous himself and his hating rival perishes.

198. The gods were so to say inferior and the Asuras superior. By means of the inferior (metres) they obtained from them what was superior (among the metres). Therefore a weaker clan fights against a stronger clan. Therefore it also happens that weaker folks conquer stronger enemies. He who knows thus gets into his power someone who possesses more, although he himself possesses less[32].

That metre is evidently a Paṅkti which consists of five Pādas and five syllables (in each Pāda). They chant the laud of the Ṣoḍaśin on Paṅktis[33]. The Paṅkti is a metre which is equated with man[34], because man is fivefold. Out of man he thereby forms speech which is complete (*āpta*). Therefore man speaks all speeches. For then man is complete as it were, speaking all speech. When they chant the laud on Anuṣṭubhs, this would be like driving to the oceans when the water-pots have become dried up[35].

They transfer the inferior metres to the superior ones. The inferior ones are those whose deities have become conquered. Therefore they transfer them to the superior ones. Of these metres forsooth the threesyllabic one consisting of one Pāda is the most powerful. That they make interpolations (*upasargas*) with these metres in (other) metres[36] is done in order to obtain power. He passess across to the finale with an *atisvāra*[37]. The gods passed from the day towards the night. He who knows thus conquers the world of his rival. For the night is as it were a rallying-point[38] of rivals.

199. They buy the Soma with a cow that has excessive (i.e. excessively long) ears[39]. The Ṣoḍaśin is like an excrescence[40] on every ear of the other Stotras. Saying "We buy together[41] (with the Soma) the Ṣoḍaśin", they buy the Ṣoḍaśin, when the cow serving as the price of the Soma plant has excessive ears[42]. Thereby the Ṣoḍaśin is bought by them, thereby it is obtained.

They buy the Soma with a cow that has excessive ears. They leave some redundant Soma from every pressing. They praise on verses which contain a form of the root *jan* ("to beget"). All the forms (?: *sarvāni rūpāṇi*) are recited. When they buy the Soma with a cow that has excessive ears, the Yajamāna thereby produces it (i.e. the Ṣoḍaśin). When they leave some redundant Soma from every pressing, the Adhvaryu priest thereby produces it[43]. When they praise on verses which contain a form of the root *jan*[44], the Udgātṛ thereby produces it. When 'all the forms' are recited, the Hotṛ thereby produces it. These are the births of the Ṣoḍaśin. He who knows thus becomes procreative with offspring and cattle.

200. Energy (*haras*) surpassed Indra. He said to the gods: "How could the energy not surpass me"? To him all the gods said: "We shall praise you with a verse containing the word *hari*. Thus the energy will not surpass you". All the gods praised him with a verse which contained the word *hari*. Then the energy (*haras*)[45] did not surpass Indra. When they praise on verses containing the word *hari*, they thereby invigorate Indra with energy. Indra is the deity who is nearest to the sacrificer[46]. When they praise on verses containing the word *hari*, they thereby invigorate the sacrificer with energy and ardour. For him who knows thus there is prosperity.

201. The Ṣoḍaśin forsooth is like a side-horse[47] for the other Stotras. When a side-horse draws (the chariot) without being yoked it either cuts off or destroys (the straps or cords). On account of the last Stotra it (the Ṣoḍaśin) becomes a balanced Stoma. As one might yoke the side-horse[48], even so one yokes the Ṣoḍaśin (the sixteenth Stotra) to the other Stotras, in order to avoid destruction[49].

The Ṣoḍaśin forsooth is like an eye for the other Stotras. On account of the last Stotra it (the Ṣoḍaśin) becomes a balanced Stoma, in order to avoid blindness[50].

The Ṣoḍaśin forsooth is like a relative for the other Stotras. On account of the last Stotra it (the Ṣoḍaśin) becomes a balanced Stoma, in order to maintain variation[51].

The Ukthas are cattle, the Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra[52]. When at the end of the Ukthas they praise with the Ṣoḍaśin, then they enclose the cattle with a Vajra[52] in order that they do not become scattered[53]. The property of him who knows thus does not become scattered.

202. Now they say: "The Ṣoḍaśin should not be applied in an Ukthya[54]. The Ukthas are cattle[55], the Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra[56]. One would hurl a Vajra at the cattle. It should be applied in an Atirātra. Water is the appeasement of everything[57]. Thereby they extinguish it (i.e. the Ṣoḍaśin Vajra)[58].

When the Soma ritual is fit for exorcising, everybody who carries out the (magical) rite should make a gold, pronged Vajra and hurl it at this one or that one. Every time he strikes at him in order to lay him down. After the Soma rite has become finished he should turn the Droṇakalaśa vessel topsyturvy and having made sacrificial cakes consisting either of groats or of green grasses he should cut off their necks, mentioning the names (of the adversaries): "Here I cut off the neck of so and so, here of so and so, here of so and so". He cuts off the necks of all those whose names he mentions. He gives it to the Brahman[59]. The Vajra is the Brahman. Thereby he places the Vajra in the Brahman.

203. Indra and Bṛhat met each other. The Bṛhat surpassed Indra with one of its manifestations[60]. He was afraid of it, fearing: "It won't

overcome me, I hope". He said to the gods: "This (form by which it exceeds me) should become the Ṣoḍaśin sacrifice". "Yes". It became the Ṣoḍaśin. This is its origin. He who knows thus surpasses[61] his hating rival in prosperity, when he praises on twofooted Gāyatrī verses with the Bṛhat as Ṣoḍaśin[62]. The twofooted Gāyatrī verses are: "Unto our Soma come with bay steeds"[63].

[64]Indra wished to slay Vṛtra. He resorted to Prajāpati saying: "I will slay Vṛtra". To him he gave this Anuṣṭubh[65] of which the energy was taken away. He did not lay low (Vṛtra) with it. What he roared (*vyanadat*) when he failed to lay him down[66], that became the Nānada Sāman. Therefore the Nānada is called Nānada[64]. Therefore they say: "One should not[67] make the Nānada the Sāman of the Ṣoḍaśin, for he (Indra) failed to lay low (Vṛtra) with it"[68]. He again resorted to him (P.) saying: "I will slay Vṛtra". He (P.) formed the energy of the seven Hotrā(-functions)[69], three verses out of every Hotrā, and gave it to him. This twenty-one-versed Stoma became equal to the Ṣoḍaśin. Thereby he killed Vṛtra. He who knows thus slays his hating rival[68]). The Ṣoḍaśin has twenty-one strongholds. Seven Hotṛs make the Vaṣaṭ call at the morning-service, seven at the midday-service, seven at the afternoon-service[70].

And because he formed the energy (*haras*) and gave it to him[71] (therefore)

204. Gaurīviti, the son of Śakti, saw this Sāman as a surplus[72] of the Brahman (= Veda, i.e. Ṛgvedasaṃhitā). That became the Gaurīvita Sāman[73]. The Gaurīvita is the surplus of the Brahman, the Ṣoḍaśin the surplus of the Stotras. When they praise the Ṣoḍaśin with the Gaurīvita Sāman they place the surplus with the surplus, for the sake of the harmony[74] of the sacrifice.

Aupoditi, the son of Gopāla, said: "He (i.e. the Udgātṛ) has placed a creeper on the thick (tree). He has applied the Nānada Sāman to the Anuṣṭubh[75]. He has praised with the Gaurīvita[76] (thinking) "I do not lose prosperity". He who knows thus, does not lose prosperity.

It (i.e. the Gaurīvita) is also connected with the day of tomorrow and leads to progeny[77].

He who desires to have cattle should perform the Ṣoḍaśin Sāman on Śakvarī verses. The Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra, the Śakvarīs are cattle[78]. He wins cattle by means of a Vajra, and comes into possession of cattle. He who desires: "May I come into possession of a Vajra", should perform the Ṣoḍaśin on Śakvarī verses. The Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra, the Śakvarī verses are a Vajra. By means of a Vajra he obtains a Vajra and he comes into possession of a Vajra[79]. He who wishes food should perform the Ṣoḍaśin on Virāj verses. The Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra, the Virāj means food. By means of a Vajra he obtains food, he eats food and becomes an

eater of food[80]. These verses count thirty-three syllables. Among these twenty-one form the support and twelve the procreation. He who knows thus gets a firm support, gets offspring and is not overcome between two conflicting parties[81].

205. "Bring to the great, of great prosperity"[82], these are the Virāj verses. He who wishes: "May not the word of someone else outtalk me" should make the Ṣoḍaśin Sāman on Anuṣṭubhs. The Ṣoḍaśin is a Vajra, the Anuṣṭubh means speech. By means of a Vajra he obtains speech, the speech of someone else does not outtalk him[83]. "Mount the chariot, o Vṛtrakiller"[84] these are the Anuṣṭubh verses. Now (there are) those one-footed, three-syllabic Bhurij-Śakvarī verses: Viṣṇu's metre. With them Indra killed Vṛtra, with them he quickly obtained prosperity. He who knows thus kills his hating rival and quickly obtains prosperity[85].

Passing (from hand to hand a piece of) gold they chant the laud of the Ṣoḍaśin. Thereby they provide the Ṣoḍaśin with light[86].

A horse stands near[87] for the representation (of Prajāpati)[88]. It stands there blowing away the room of their rivals[89].

Singing: "Higher than whom no one is born, he who encompasses all beings, Prajāpati, who bestows people with offspring, is associated with three lights, he the Ṣoḍaśin" (the Udgātṛ) looks at the Soma that has been drawn (by the Adhvaryu) for the Ṣoḍaśin[90]. (If the Ṣoḍaśin is based on verses which contain the word *hari*)[91] with the verse: "Indra, the paramount sovereign and Varuṇa, the sovereign, both have consumed this in the beginning. I consume this following and in agreement with their consuming. Speech must happily enjoy the Soma"[92].

[93]The monosyllabic metre was the lowest of the gods, the sevensyllabic the highest. The ninesyllabic was the lowest of the Asuras, the fifteensyllabic their highest. The gods desired: "May we take away[94] the bigger one of the Asuras by means of the smaller". They took away the fifteensyllabic with the monosyllabic. With the bisyllabic they took away the fourteensyllabic, with the threesyllabic the thirteensyllabic, with the foursyllabic the twelvesyllabic, with the fivesyllabic the elevensyllabic, with the sixsyllabic the tensyllabic, with the sevensyllabic the ninesyllabic, with eight syllables the eight (of the Asuras)[93]. In this way he who knows thus gets into his possession (the property) of a hating rival who is superior by means of something which is inferior[95].

IV. THE ATIRĀTRA (206–232)

Weber, *Ind. Stud.* 9 (1865), 120–121; 229–230; 10 (1968), 352–354; Hillebrandt, *Ritual-Litteratur*, 138; *Vedische Mythologie* III, 216–217; Eggeling, *SBE* XLI (1894), XVII–XX; 127, n. 1; Keith, *Rel. and Phil.*, 335–336; *The Veda of the Black Yajus School*, I, CXVI–XCVII; Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, 2 (Poona 1941), 1205; Staal, *Agni*, I, 663–686; E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, "The Atirātra according to the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa", *Agni*, II, 161–167
PB. 9, 1–2

IV. 1. *The Atirātra in general; the rounds (pariyāyas)* (206–208)

Oertel, *Transactions CAAS 15* (New Haven, 1909), 162–163; 166–167; Staal, *Agni* I, 663–680
PB. 9, 1, 1–5; 16, 19–26; AB. 4, 5–6; ŚāṅkhB. 17, 5; 8–9

206. The Asuras who had been driven away from the day, entered the night. The gods constructed this (Atirātra) Vajra which has the Anuṣṭubh as its head[1]. Herewith they persecuted them. This (Vajra) was speech[2]. They persecuted (them) with speech, i.e. with light[3]. This (speech-Vajra) is a Virāj[4]. They persecuted (them) with a Virāj, with light.

The Atirātra is not a good sacrifice one might say. It is only on account of the word *pāntam*[5] that this sacrifice is made useful to be undertaken[6], for the sake of the continuity and the uninterruptedness[7] of night and day.

The metres which bear the day, also bear the night[8]: the same Gāyatrī, the same Virāj, the same Kakubh, the same Anuṣṭubh.

They praise on Bṛhatī verses. Thereby they do not become separated from[9] the Bṛhatīs. On account of the twelvesyllabic Pādas they do not become separated from[9] the Jagatīs. He makes the Vaṣaṭ call with a Triṣṭubh. Thereby they do not become separated from[9] the Triṣṭubhs[10].

[11]Running after[12] them (i.e. the Asuras) with the Saṃdhi (Stotra) they (the gods) made them meet with a defeat which could not be repaired[13] anymore[11]. He who knows thus makes his hating rival meet with an irrepairable defeat.

[14]The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is the match of the Agniṣṭoma: The Agniṣṭoma contains twelve lauds and the night also contains twelve lauds[15]. The night is the match of the Ukthya. There are three Ukthas and the Twilight (i.e. the Saṃdhi Stotra) has three deities[14]. The night is the match of the Agniṣṭoma and of the year. There are twelve

Stotras in an Agniṣṭoma and the year has twelve months[16]. By the night the thirteenth month is obtained. The night is the highest position of the sun[17]. He who knows thus, goes to the highest position of the sun.

207. The Atirātra is a sacrifice which covers everything[18]. There is no day without a night and no night without a day. These worlds do not have separately the one and the other. Night and day are this all, these worlds, and they produce the past and the future[19].

As to this they say: "A sacrificer should not start sacrificing with an Atirātra". For he despises his own property. There are two sacrifices (namely the sacrifices of the day-time and the Atirātra). The Agniṣṭoma is the own property of the Brahmin. He despises the Agniṣṭoma, the Ukthya and the Ṣoḍaśin. Now they also say: "By means of the Agniṣṭoma one only wins the Agniṣṭoma, by means of the Ukthya only the Ukthya, by means of the Ṣoḍaśin only the Ṣoḍaśin, but by means of the night (i.e. the Atirātra) one obtains everything". He who knowing thus annexes four sacrifices by means of one sacrifice, for him four strong men are born[20] and he obtains a strong position in cattle.

208. [21]The Asuras who had been driven away from the day, entered the night. The gods saw these chants and these (nocturnal) rounds. By means of these they went down after them. They killed them successively (litt.: in rounds)[22]. Because they killed them in several rounds (*paryāyam*), therefore the rounds (*paryāya*) are called rounds. He who knows thus, gradually kills his hating rival.

[23]Those (Asuras) who were concealed by the first part of the night, they killed by means of the first round. In that the first stanzas of the first round are repeated, thereby they kill those who are concealed by the first part of the night. Those (Asuras) who were concealed by the middle part of the night, they killed by means of the middle round. In that the middle stanzas of the middle round are repeated, thereby they kill those who are concealed by the middle part of the night. Those (Asuras) who were concealed by the later part of the night, they killed by means of the last round. In that the last stanzas of the last round are repeated, thereby they kill those who are concealed by the later part of the night[23].

They killed them with repeated blows[24]. It is like hammering and hammering again. He who knows thus, kills his hating rival with repeated blows.

IV. 2. *The Sandhistotra and its corresponding Śastra, the Āśvina* (209–213)

Oertel, TCAAS 15 (1909), 163–169; Staal, *Agni* I, 680–682
PB. 9, 1, 1–5; 16; 19–26; 35–37; AB. 4, 5–8; ŚāṅkhB. 17, 5; 8; 9; 18, 1

209. The night is called the spotted (*śarvarī*). The gods said: "We

have got a share (*api*) in the spotted". Therefore the Apiśarvarī metres are called the Apiśarvarīs[1]. He who knows thus, gets a share in the spotted (night).

In the beginning this (universe) was with the Asuras. The gods having conquered it said: "Whereby may we join together day and night at the end (of the night)?" They saw this Rathantara Sāman as a joint (*saṃdhi*)[2]. Hereby they joined together day and night at the end (of the night). Because they joined them together (*samadadhur*), therefore the Saṃdhi (Stotra) is called Saṃdhi.

The Uktha[3] belonging to the Saṃdhi Stotra is the Āśvina. At an advanced stage of the night they chant the Saṃdhi (Stotra), till sunrise they recite thereafter the Āśvina (Śastra), for the sake of the continuity of the night and day and for the sake of the mutual connection[4] of night and day.

The gods having won night and day made an enclosure[5] in the form of a Vajra[6] in order to protect the cattle, lest the Asuras should assail them. As to the fact that these Uṣṇih verses are used at the end—the Uṣṇih verses are a Vajra[7]—by means of a Vajra they enclose the cattle, in order that they may not be scattered[8]. The prosperity of someone who knows thus, does not become scattered[8].

210. In the beginning this (universe) was with the Asuras. The gods having conquered it said: "Let us divide it among ourselves". They could not agree on its division. They said: "Let us run a race for it"[9]. They ran a race for it. Agni's chariot was first, then (came) that of Uṣas, then that of the Aśvins. These two Aśvins[10]. When these two were driving along, Agni blocked (their way). The two said: "Let us pass". "No" he said, "you two should give me then at least a share". "A third for you" they said, "but it should be named after us two only". "Yes" he said and let them pass. When these two were driving along, Uṣas blocked (their way). The two said: "Let us pass". "No", she said, "You two should give me a share". "One third for you", they said, "but it should be named after us only". "Yes", she said and let the two pass. These two won. He who knows this victory of the Aśvins, wins, when he wishes: "May I win here". And he who knows this share of Agni and Uṣas, obtains a share, when he wishes: "May I obtain a share". Therefore they praise with verses addressed to several gods[11] but (the Śastra) is called Āśvina; for that was the boon chosen by these two.

211. The gods and the Asuras were at strife about night and day. The gods conquered the day. Then the Asuras entered the Ṛc and the night. The gods said: "We have obtained half of this universe as our share. How could we completely conquer the night? Let us attack with our most precious possessions"[12] "With your metre", they said to Agni. "With your Stoma", (they said) to Indra. "With your equivalence"[13]

(they said) to Prajāpati. "With your abode", (they said) to the All-gods. Because they said to Agni "With your metre", therefore they chant Gāyatrī verses[14]. Because they said to Indra "With your Stoma", therefore the night (i.e. the Atirātra) has the fifteenfold as its Stotra[15]. Because they said to Prajāpati "With your equivalence (*sampad*)", therefore he accomplishes (*sampadyate*) the Anuṣṭubh[16]. Because they said to the All-gods "With your abode", therefore they recite thereafter verses in the Jagatī metre[17]. Running after them (the Asuras) with the Saṃdhi (Stotra) they made them meet with an irrepairable defeat by means of the Āśvina (Śastra). He who knows thus, makes his hating rival meet with an irrepairable defeat[18].

212. Having driven[19] the Asuras out of night and day the gods held them down with a Vajra in the form of a Trivṛt[20]. These worlds are threefold. Thus they held them down with these worlds. Therefore they say: "As long as these worlds will exist, so long the Asuras will not exist". For they are held down by these worlds.

[21]The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is the match of the Agniṣṭoma and of the year. The year has twenty-four half-months, and the Ukthas and the potations of the night are twenty-four[21]. There are three (daily) pressings and three (nocturnal) rounds. In this way they make the night consisting of three pressings and they shape her out of the day as it were.

Having conquered night and day the gods led yonder sun westward by means of the (three successive) pressings. By means of the rounds they led him again eastward. They made him rise in the east with the Āśvina (Śastra). Therefore they say: "The Āśvina (Śastra) should not be recited after sunrise". (By reciting after sunrise) he makes him (the sun) go apart (from the Śastra). By him who knows this thus, yonder sun is led westward by means of the pressings, brought again eastward by means of the rounds, raised in the east by means of the Āśvina (Śastra). By him night and day are won, obtained, for his pleasure the sun shines.

213. The Saṃdhi (Stotra) is chanted with the Rathantara (Sāman). Prajāpati gave his daughter Uṣas to Bṛhaspati (in marriage). He gave the Āśvina (Śastra consisting of) thousand (verses) as her dowry. He said to the gods: "This (woman) is mine, the rest is yours". Therefore, when a noble-minded man wins a wife, he distributes the dowry[22]. The gods said: "Let us divide this". They could not agree about its division and said: "Let us run a race for it". They ran a race for it. Agni's chariot was first, then came that of Uṣas[23], then that of the Aśvins. These two Aśvins . . .[10]. The gods said to these two: "This (victory) is a boon which we grant to you, but we should have a share". Therefore they praise with verses addressed to several gods, but (the Śastra) is called Āśvina[22]. To Agni they chant first, then to Uṣas, then to the Aśvins, for thus were their victories[24].

There is one Sāman, there are two metres. He thus places the two-legged (man) above[25] the four-legged animals. Therefore the two-legged man rules[25] the four-legged animals.

He should pronounce the final stanza while the sun has not yet risen, if he should wish with regard to someone: "May he become worse". He certainly becomes worse. He should pronounce the final stanza at daybreak, if he should wish with regard to someone: "May he be neither here nor there". He is certainly neither here nor there. But Parjanya becomes full of rain[26]. He should pronounce the final stanza after sunrise, if he should wish with regard to someone: "May he become better, may he obtain splendour". He certainly becomes better and obtains splendour.

IV. 3. *The Sāmans of the Atirātra*

IV. 3. 1. *The Vaitahavya Sāman* (214)

Auswahl, 82–83
PB. 9, 1, 6–1; 9, 2, 1

214. The verses beginning with "Him who drinks (*pāntam*) of the Soma"[1] contain the word *andhas* (Soma). The word *andhas* ("Soma", "darkness") means night, *pāntam* means day[2]. This is for the continuity of night and day and for the mutual connection[3] of night and day.

On these verses the Vaitahavya is chanted with the word *okas* ("house") as its finale. The gods drove the Asuras out of every house by means of the Vaitahavya with the word "house" as its finale. By means of the Vaitahavya with the word "house" as its finale he who knows thus, drives his hating rival out of every house. The house forsooth is the vital airs. Thereby he appropriates the vital airs of his hating rival and places them in himself.

Now they say: "They who undertake the Atirātra, become deprived of this world". In that it has the word "house" as its finale—the house of man is this world—, thereby one gets a strong foothold in this world.

Vītahavya Āśrāyasa[4], who was wandering[5] for a long time expelled (from his realm), desired: "May I return to my own house". He saw this chant. He praised with it. He applied *okā*[6] ("house") as its finale. Thereupon he returned to his own house. This is a wish-granting chant. This was the wish he cherished. This wish was fulfilled for him. Whatever wish one may cherish, when one praises with this chant, it will become fulfilled for him. And since it was the royal dignity (which he, Vītahavya, desired on that occasion), he then obtained kingship. He who knows thus obtains royal dignity and kingship. And since Vītahavya Āśrāyasa saw (this chant), therefore it is called Vaitahavya Okonidhana ("With the word house as its finale").

IV. 3. 2. *The Śyāktya Sāman* (215)

JB. 1, 216

215. The verses beginning with "unto Indra an intoxicating"[1] contain the root "to be intoxicated" (*mad*). The word *mada* "intoxication" (also) means "sap, juice, fluid". The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is sucked out as it were, it is pressed out as it were[2]. They do not perform a new pressing for this rite. Whatever residue of Soma they leave over at that time, when the third pressing takes place, thereby they perform (the sacrifice) at that night. In that these verses contain the root *mad* ("to be intoxicated"), thereby they confer juice on that night. Thereby they strengthen it[3].

On these verses the Śāktya is sung. By means of the Śāktya the Śāktyas obtained cattle. Therefore the Śāktya is called Śāktya. This now is a chant whereby one can obtain cattle. He who knows thus, obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle.

The Śāktyas who were desirous of food, practised austerity. They saw this chant. They praised with it. Thereupon they obtained food. (The status)[4] of this (chant) is just as that of the Gaurīvita. The Gaurīvita means food. And food is also connected with the day of tomorrow[5]. Food is also the surplus of everything here. This night (i.e. this Atirātra) is a surplus as it were. They place redundant food in this night[6]. This chant has a special tone. Tone is breath[7]. And the breaths (or life) are also food[8]. This chant now is the obtainment of regular food. He who knows thus obtains food, becomes an eater of food and the most eminent among his own people. And because the Śāktyas saw it, therefore it is called Śāktya.

IV. 3. 3. *The Kāṇva Sāman* (216)

Auswahl, 83
PB. 9, 2, 5–6; JB. 1, 215

216. The Kāṇva chant is sung on verses beginning with "We (praise) you, wishing to obtain this,"[1]. Kaṇva, the son of Nṛṣad, who was wandering for a long time without firm support[2], desired: "May I obtain firm support". He saw this chant and praised with it. He applied *rantāyā* ("for the sake of rest")[3] as its finale. He who has no firm support, has no rest as it were. The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is vibration as it were[4]; this (chant) is a rest (*rati*). Then he obtained a firm support. This chant here is a firm support. He who knows thus, obtains a firm support. And because Kaṇva, the son of Nṛṣad, saw it, therefore it is called Kāṇva.

The verses beginning with "To Indra, who is given to joy, the pressed out (Soma)"[5] contain the root "to be intoxicated" (*mad*). The word

mada ("intoxication") (also) means "sap, juice, fluid". The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is sucked out as it were, it is pressed out as it were. They do not perform a new pressing for this rite. Whatever residue of Soma they leave over at that time, when the third pressing takes place, thereby they perform (the sacrifice) at night. In that these verses contain the root *mad* ("to be intoxicated"), thereby they confer juice on that night. Thereby they strengthen it.

IV. 3. 4. *The Śrautakakṣa Sāman* (217)

Auswahl, 84
PB. 9, 2, 7; 13, 7, 10

217. On these verses they sing the Śrautakakṣa chant. Śrutakakṣa, the son of Kakṣīvat, desiring cattle practised austerity. He saw this chant and praised with it. He used this (word) *iḷā* as its finale. Iḷā means cattle[1]. Then he obtained cattle.

This is a chant which provides cattle. He who knows thus, obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle.

It is a chant in which the words of the metrical text are repeated again and again[2]. Whenever the gods discovered the sap of the metrical texts (or: of the metres), they made it repeatedly pierced (*punarnitunnam*)[2]. They struck it again and again. The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is sucked out as it were. In that (the chant) has a repeated repetition of the metrical text, thereby they place sap in it (i.e. in the night). This is a continuance of the sap. And because Śrutakakṣa, the son of Kakṣīvat, saw it, therefore it is called Śrautakakṣa.

[3]This (chant) has the word *iḷā* as finale. It is a Sāman related to the Śastra of the Acchāvāka priest. Iḷā means cattle. Thereby he becomes firmly established in cattle[3].

IV. 3. 5. *The Aurdhvasadmana Sāman* (218–219)

Auswahl, 84–86
PB. 9, 1, 12–14; 9, 2, 10–12

218. There is the verse "Here is Soma, o Indra, for you"[1]. This is a repeated announcement of the oblation. They mean to say to Indra by this (verse): "Here is another sacrifice for you"[2]. The night (the Atirātra) is the second oblation which is made.

On these verses (they chant) the Aurdhvasadmana. By means of the Aurdhvasadmana the gods went upward (*ūrdhva*) and settled (*asīdan*) in these worlds. Because they went upward (*ūrdhva*) and settled (*asīdan*) in these worlds, therefore the Aurdhvasadmana is called Aurdhvasadmana. This is a chant which leads to heaven. He who knows

thus, goes upward and settles in heaven by means of this (chant). By means of the Aurdhvasadmana the gods appropriated the cattle of the Asuras through (the Stobha) "with excellent lauds" (which formed part of the finale of the chant). With (the Stobha) "intoxicating man" they hurled a Vajra at them. With "in the battles" they mounted heaven.

They say that these (Stobhas) should be separately applied—these worlds are different—in order to keep these (worlds) apart. "With excellent lauds" is this world, "intoxicating man" the intermediate world, "in the battles" heaven. Therefore they have to be applied separately (i.e. each in one of the finales), in order to keep these worlds apart.

219. As to this Jānaśruteya said: "The finale is the strength of the chant. If one should apply (the Stobhas) separately, one would disturb[3] it, one would disjoin it. They should be applied together (in all the finales), in order that the chant may possess strength." They are four-syllabic. The intention is: "The four quarters which there are in this world, may we get a firm support in all of them. The four quarters which there are in the intermediate world, may we get a firm support in all of them. The four quarters which there are in yonder world, may we get a firm support in all of them".

By means of the Aurdhvasadmana the night (i.e. the Atirātra) (symbolically) obtains Pṛṣṭha Stotras. This world forms the Rathantara, the intermediate world the Vāmadevya and yonder world the Bṛhat[4]. Moreover the best of these worlds are the tops (*pṛṣṭhāni*). He who knows thus, becomes one of them. Prajāpati forsooth is the elevated seat (*ūrdhavasadma*). He who knows thus, obtains the position of Prajāpati.

IV. 3. 6. *The Vaiṇava or Āpāla Sāman* (220–221)

Oertel, *JAOS* 18 (1987), 28–30; Ghosh, *Fragments*, 57–60; Rau, *AS* 20 (1966), 87–88; *German Scholars* I, 219–220
PB. 9, 2, 13–14

220. The Vaiṇava chant is sung on verses beginning with "For us, o Indra, rich in food"[1]. Veṇu, the son of Viśvāmitra, desired: "May I become the foremost and most prominent Vedic scholar". He saw this chant and praised with it. Then he became the foremost and most prominent Vedic scholar. He who knows thus, becomes the foremost and most prominent Vedic scholar. Because Veṇu, the son of Viśvāmitra, saw it, it is called the Vaiṇava.

They also call it the Āpāla[2]. Apālā Ātreyī had moles or sores on her skin[3]. She desired: "May I get rid of my bad complexion". She saw this chant and praised with it. Going down to a ford she found[4] a Soma-

stalk. She chewed it. Then her teeth sounded like pressing stones. Indra came running thither (thinking) "The pressing stones are sounding". She spoke to (him): "A girl going down to the water has found Soma on her path. Taking it home she said: 'For Indra I will press you, for Śakra I will press you"[5].

When Indra found out "Her teeth sound here like pressing stones", he turned away. She said to him: "Young man, you there who are going attentively from house to house, drink this (Soma) which is pressed out with the teeth and which is accompanied by fried grain, porridge, cake and a hymn"[6].

When he did not take notice of her, she said to him: "I have not even set my mind on you, I am not even longing for you"[7]. Indra, thinking "Apālā has been praising me for some time already with all sorts of verses"[8], turned back. (At the words) "Softly as it were, a little bit softly so they say, flow for Indra, o juice"[9] he sucked Soma from her mouth. For him who knowing thus kisses the mouth of a woman, it becomes like a Soma drink.

221. He said to her: "Apālā, what is your wish?" She said: "Make these three surfaces grow over, Indra: the head and the cornfield of my father and moreover this here on my belly[10]. Make all these become hairy"[11]. Her father was bald. He cured his baldness. His cornfield bore nothing. It bore fruit now. There was no hair on her pudenda. They also grew now. He pulled her through the nave-hole of a chariot[12]. Then she became an iguana. He pulled her through the nave-hole of a cart. Then she became a chameleon. He pulled her through a yoke-hole. Then she became a *saṃśliṣṭikā*[13]. To this is referred in the following verse: "Having cleansed Apālā thrice, in a nave-hole of a chariot, in a nave-hole of a cart and in a yoke-hole, you, Indra Śatakratu, gave her a sun-like skin"[14]. She got the most beautiful appearance. This is a wish-granting chant. This was the wish she wished and it was fulfilled for her. If anyone having a wish praises with that chant, that wish is fulfilled for him. And because Apālā, the daughter of Atri, saw it, therefore it is called Āpāla [2].

IV. 3. 7. *The Ārṣabha or Daivodāsa Sāman* (222)

Auswahl, 86
PB. 9, 2, 8–9; 15

222. The Ārṣabha chant is sung on verses beginning with "Unto the Soma thee, o Bull"[1]. Indra desired: "May I become the bull (*ṛṣabha*) of all the creatures, may I become the best. He saw this chant and praised with it. Then he became the bull of all the creatures, he became the best. Therefore the Ārṣabha is called Ārṣabha. He who knows thus,

becomes the bull among his own people, he becomes the best.

They also call it the Daivodāsa. Divodāsa, the son of Vadhryaśva, desired: "May I obtain the class of the Brahmins as well as that of the Kṣatriyas. May I being a king still be a seer." He saw this chant and praised with it. Then he obtained both the class of the Brahmins and that of the Kṣatriyas. Being a king he became a seer. He who knows thus, obtains both the class of the Brahmins and that of the Kṣatriyas; Being a king he becomes a seer. And because Divodāsa, the son of Vadhryaśva, saw it, therefore it is called Daivodāsa.

IV. 3. 8. *The Gāra Sāman* (223)

Auswahl, 86–87; Caland's n. 3 on PB. 9, 2, 16
PB. 9, 2, 16

223. The Gāra chant is sung on verses beginning with "Here, o Good one, is the pressed plant"[1]. The Asuras strewed some poison for the gods. Not knowing (what is was) and thinking it to be food they swallowed it. Then they got the idea that they had been poisoned. They desired: "May we get rid of this poison which has been swallowed". They saw this chant and praised with it. Thereby they got rid of the swallowed poison (*garān gīrṇān*)[2]. This became the mountains (*girayo*). Because they got rid of the swallowed poison (*garān gīrṇān*), therefore the Gāra is called Gāra. He who may think that he has been poisoned, because he accepted something from someone from whom one should not accept something, and because he has eaten something from someone whose food one should not eat[3], should praise with this (chant). He gets rid of the swallowed poison and from the evil which has been done by him.

[4]This (chant) has the word *iḷā* as its finale. It is a Sāman related to the Śastra of the Acchāvāka priest. Iḷā means cattle. Thereby he become firmly established in cattle[4].

IV. 3. 9. *The Ghṛtaścunnidhana and the Madhuścunnidhana Sāmans* (224–225)

Auswahl, 87–88
PB. 9, 1, 17–18; 9, 2, 17; 13, 11, 16–18

224. The Ghṛtaścunnidhana chant (the Sāman which has the word *Ghṛtaścut* as its finale) is sung on the verses beginning with: "For through this with might"[1]. By means of (the finales) *ghṛtaścut* and *madhuścut* ("ghee-dripping" and "honey-dripping) the gods made the sacrifice swell, whenever it became dried up. Therefore they say: "Swell like a Soma sprout". The night (i.e. the Atirātra) is dried up[2] as it were. In

that the chant has the finale "dripping with ghee", thereby he makes it swell.

When the Aṅgirases went to heaven, two, Ghṛtaścut and Madhuścut, were left behind. They desired: "May we two fly up after them to heaven". They practised austerity. They saw these two chants and praised with them. When they praised with the finales "for Ghṛtaścut" and "for Madhuścut", they flew after them to heaven.

Ghee is the top of the drinks based on milk, heaven the top of the worlds. Honey is the top of the juices, heaven the top of the worlds. By means of two top-chants they reached the top-world, heaven. He who knows thus, reaches the top-world, heaven, by means of the top-chants.

Cattle is ghee-dripping[3], honey-dripping. Thus these two obtained cattle by means of these two chants. And they also went to heaven by sacrificing with this cattle. These two chants procure cattle and lead to heaven. He who knows thus, obtains cattle and goes to heaven.

225. These two chants are the breasts of the sacrifice. By means of these Indra milked all what he desired from the sacrifice. He who knows thus, milks all what he desires from the sacrifice[4]. Of these two the one has a *yajus* as finale, the other has a Sāman's finale. The chant ending in *ghṛtaścut* has a *yajus* as finale, the chant ending in *madhuścut* has a Sāman's finale[5]. He who knows thus, gets the prosperity which is achieved by a Yajus and a Sāman as well as the (concomitant) wishes.

Now they say: "When they use clarified butter in the ritual of the day-time, whereby does (the ritual of) their night become provided with clarified butter?" One should say: "By means of the chant with *ghṛtaścut* ("ghee-dripping") as its finale". Thereby the night becomes provided with clarified butter. And because Ghṛtaścut and Madhuścut, the two Aṅgirases, saw it, it is called thus.

IV. 3. 10. *The Maidhātitha Sāman* (226)

Auswahl, 88–89
PB. 9, 2, 18–19

226. And now the Maidhātitha chant. When the descendants of Kaṇva rose from a sacrificial session, went and yoked up[1] they[2] being hungry[3] came upon a desert[4], where there grew many gourds. They wished: "May we drive away[5] these (gourds) after they have become cows". Then Medhātithi, the descendant of Kaṇva, saw this chant. With this they sat down near (these gourds):

"Come ye hither and take place. Sing for Indra, o friends, offering praise, for the first of the many (gods), the disposer of goods, for Indra, together with the pressed Soma. He should assist at our enterprise[1] for the sake of wealth and abundance"[6].

Wealth means cattle. Then they drove away these (gourds) which had become cows. They drove them away with the Hiṃ-sound. These are the cows speckled like gourds which since then are found here. This chant now means the driving away of cattle. He who knows thus, obtains cattle and becomes rich in cattle. And because Medhātithi, the descendant of Kaṇva, saw it, therefore it is called Maidhātitha.

IV. 3. 11. *The Saumedha or Paurvātitha Sāman* (227)

Oertel, *JAOS* 18 (1897), 48
PB. 9, 2, 20

227. And now the Saumedha chant. Having killed the Asuras the gods felt rather impure and unholy. They wished: "May we become pure and holy". They saw this chant. They praised with it. Then they became pure and holy. They said: "We have become very holy (*sumedhya*)". Therefore the Saumedha chant is called Saumedha. He who knows thus, becomes pure and holy.

They call it also Paurvātitha. Pūrvātithi, the son of Arcanānas, the younger brother of Śyāvāśva, desired: "May I obtain cattle. May I get plenty of cows". He saw this chant and praised with it: "Let him come, when he hears it, with thousandfold help"[1]. He obtained thousand cows, he got plenty of cows. This now is a cattle-providing chant. He who knows thus, obtains thousand cows, he gets plenty of cows. And because Pūrvātithi, the son of Arcanānas, saw it, therefore it is called Paurvātitha.

The verses beginning with: "O Indra, at the pressed Soma"[2] are Uṣṇih-verses. The Uṣṇihs are the stronghold of the gods. In that they apply them at the end, thereby they defend the stronghold of the gods at the outskirts, in order to protect the cattle and lest the Asuras might assail them".

IV. 3. 12. *The Kautsa Sāman* (228)

Oertel, *JAOS* 18 (1897), 31–33; *Studien z. vgl. Litteraturgeschichte* 8 (1908), 116–117; K.F. Geldner, *Vedische Studien* 2 (1889), 170–179; R. Pischel, *ibidem*, 196–197; Ghosh, *Fragments*, 63–64; O'Flahery, *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*, Berkeley 1976, 334–335; *Tales of Sex and Violence*, 74–75
PB. 9, 2, 21–23

228. On these verses the Kautsa is sung. Kutsa and Luśa called upon Indra in rivalry. He came upon Kutsa's invitation[1]. He (K.) bound him with a hundred straps by the scrotum. To him Luśa spoke: "I have heard, o Indra, that you are someone who catches himself (instead of being caught), who does not give way, o bull, and stimulates the weak.

Free yourself from Kutsa. Come here. Why should someone like you remain bound by the scrotum?"[2]. Having broken them all he ran toward Luśa. Kutsa called after him: "O Indra, in the pressed Somas"[3]. He turned back to him. To him said Luśa: "*Indrā hoyi have hoyi*"[4]. He remained standing between them. He said to them both: "Take a share. I will drink personally from one of you, from the other with my greatness". "Yes". They both took a share. One obtained the self, the other the greatness. Kutsa obtained the self, Luśa the greatness. With the self (personally) he drank from the one, with his greatness from the other. With the self he drank from Kutsa, with his greatness from Luśa. His self and his greatness are his two selves. This is a chant which is connected with Indra. Attended by Indra, attended by the gods, becomes the sacrifice of him who knows thus. Indra comes to his sacrifice. And because Kutsa saw it, therefore it is called Kautsa.

[5]This chant has the word *iḷā* as its finale. It is a Sāman related to the Śastra of the Acchāvāka priest[6]. Iḷā means cattle. Thereby he becomes firmly established in cattle[5].

IV. 4. *Various Sāmans and metres for various purposes* (229)

PB. 9, 1, 28–32; 8, 10, 1–8

229. Now they say: "There should be (applied) the Rathantara in the first strophe of three verses, the Vāmadevya in the second and the Bṛhat in the third, in order to mount these worlds. The mentioned Sāmans are these worlds. The Rathantara is this world, the Vāmadevya the intermediate world[1] and the Bṛhat is yonder world. Therefore one should do so for the sake of the mounting of these worlds. The exhalation, the circulation of air in the body and the inhalation[2] are forsooth these Sāmans. The Rathantara is the exhalation, the Vāmadevya the circulating air and the Bṛhat the inhalation. Therefore one should do so for the sake of the continuity and uninterruptedness of the exhalation, the circulation and the inhalation". And he who might desire "May I obtain prosperous offspring", should apply the Rathantara in the first strophe of three verses and the Vāmadevya in the others. The Vāmadevya is Prajāpati[3]. Thereby they come to Prajāpati, to sound, in the end, for the sake of procreation.

He who desires lustre (glory) and heaven should praise with the Bṛhat. Heaven is lustre. He who knows thus reaches the Bṛhat, comes to lustre and goes to heaven. Moreover he does not abandon (his claim on) the world of his rival. For the night represents as it were the rival.

He who desires a firm support should praise with the Rathantara[4]. The Rathantara is a firm support. He gets a firm support.

He who desires the lustre of a Veda scholar should praise the Saṃdhi Stotra on Gāyatrī verses. The Gāyatrī is the Brahmin class[5]. He obtains the lustre of a Veda scholar (*brahmavarcasa*).

He who desires men[6] (should praise) on Kakubh verses. Man is a Kakubh[7]. He obtains men.

He who desires cattle (should praise) on Uṣṇihs[8]. Cattle are Uṣṇihs. He obtains cattle.

He who desires food (should praise) on Virāj-verses. The Virāj is food[9]. He becomes an eater of food.

He who desires a support (should praise) on Anuṣṭubhs. The Anuṣṭubh means support (*pratiṣṭhā*)[10]. He obtains a support.

He who desires sacrifices (should praise) on Paṅktis, i.e. he who might desire: "May the sacrifice again turn to me". The Paṅkti (the fivefold metre) is sacrifice[11]. The sacrifice again turns to him.

He who desires strength (should praise) on Triṣṭubhs. The Triṣṭubh is strength and force[12]. He obtains force and strength.

He who desires cattle (should praise) on Jagatīs. The Jagatī is cattle[13]. He obtains cattle.

Now they say: "He who praises thus, praises on one metre and with one desire in mind, but he who praises on Bṛhatīs, praises on all the metres and with a view to all desirable objects. For the Bṛhatī[14] can be equated with all these metres. The Gāyatrī and the Jagatī together make two Bṛhatīs. The Uṣṇih and the Triṣṭubh are two Bṛhatīs. The Anuṣṭubh and the Paṅkti are two Bṛhatīs. The Bṛhatī is the Bṛhatī. Therefore there should be praised on Bṛhatīs for the sake of obtaining all these metres and all these desires.

IV. 5. *General remarks on the Atirātra (especially on Trivṛt and Rathantara)* (230–232)

230. Now they say: "If the Trivṛt is the lightest of the Stomas and the Rathantara of the Sāmans, and if the Āśvina is the most important of the Śastras, why are the Trivṛt among the Stomas and the Rathantara among the Sāmans qualified[1] for standing up to the Āśvina?" One should say: "The Trivṛt is breath[2]. Everything here (which lives) is based on breath. The breaths counterbalance everything here. These (three) worlds are the Trivṛts. Everything here is based on these worlds. These (three) worlds counterbalance everything here. These worlds are on par with everything separately here. The Rathantara is speech[3]. Everything here is based on speech. This world counterbalances everything here. Speech is on a par with everything separately here. Therefore the Trivṛt among the Stomas and the Rathantara among the Sāmans are qualified for standing up to the Āśvina Śastra".

231. Now they say: "When the other sacrificial performances have a purification of the Soma (*pavamāna*), whereby does the night (i.e. the Atirātra) become provided with a purification?" One should say: "By the Sandhi Stotra chanted as a Rathantara"[4]. Thereby the night becomes provided with a purification. Thinking: "Let the end be like the beginning" they praise with this (Stotra) without repetition and applying once the exclamation Hiṃ; for they had already before[5] (i.e. at the Bahiṣpavamāna) applied this Hiṃ for the Trivṛt.

The first Trivṛt is the emission of seed, the latter is Prajāpati. The (triad consisting of) self, offspring and cattle are the strophes consisting of three verses. The Rathantara is Prajāpati[6]. As it may happen that seed is emitted and that there is no procreation, even so it would be if they should praise with verses which are accompanied with only one Hiṃ-sound. That they make the sound Hiṃ for every verse of the tercet, is done for the sake of procreation. He who knows thus becomes wealthy and procreative.

Moreover one of these Paryāyas would have a stronghold, two would be without a stronghold[7], if they should praise with verses which are only once accompanied with the sound Hiṃ. In that they pronounce the sound Hiṃ for every tercet, thereby the whole night (the whole Atirātra) of these obtains a purification and a stronghold. Just as the day is the night, just as the night is the day: morning, midday, afternoon, first part of the night, midnight, last part of the night. That they pronounce the sound Hiṃ for every tercet is done for sake of the (threefold) arrangement of both night and day.

232. Now they say: "If all the sacrifices (belonging to the Jyotiṣṭoma type) are concluded (ultimately) after the twenty-one fold Stoma, and the night (i.e. the Atirātra) exceeds the twenty-one, whereby does their night then still conclude after the twenty-one fold?" He should say: "Because these Trivṛts replace the number twenty-one and there are (thus) nine twenty-ones".

Now Bhāllaveya said: "Who will now[8] sacrifice with a sacrifice with a light on both sides[9]?" The Atirātra is a sacrifice with a light on both sides. On the foreside there is a Trivṛt, the Bahiṣpavamāna, on the backside there is a Trivṛt, the Sandhi sung as a Rathantara. Agni is the first Trivṛt, the sun the other. This world has a light through Agni, yonder world through the sun. By him who knows thus there is sacrificed with a sacrifice which has a light on both sides and he obtains a light in this and in yonder world.

Of these two, the Brahmin class and the Kṣatriya class, the Brahmin class is the Trivṛt and the Kṣatriya class the Fifteenfold Stoma[10]. Thus the Brahmin and the Kṣatriya class make an agreement here and lead the night (the Atirātra). Thus the Brahmin and the Kṣatriya class make

an agreement here and strike off evil at the end. Because these two Stomas are applied at the end he who knows thus strikes off evil for himself. Because these two agree with the Gāyatrī—the Gāyatrī is brilliance[11] and the lustre of a Vedic scholar[12]—therefore one becomes firmly established in brilliance and the lustre of a Vedic scholar. Moreover one thereby places the sacrificer in the full length of life for the sake of complete lifetime. The Gāyatrī is breath[13]. He who knows thus obtains a full lifetime.

V. ADDENDA (GENERAL REMARKS AND REPETITIONS) (233–341)

V. 1. *The saṃpads of the Agniṣṭoma (i.a. the Virāj)* (233–244)

Auswahl, 89–96; K. Klaus, *Die altindische Kosmologie. Nach den Brāhmaṇas dargestellt*, Bonn 1986, 65–66; H. Falk, *Bruderschaft und Würfelspiel*, Freiburg 1986, 124–125; 132; Bodewitz, "Virāj and Kṛta in Sāmavedic ritualistic arithmetics", *ABORI* 68, (1987), 207–214.

PB. 6, 3, 6; 16, 1, 8–9; ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 1

233. One should perform this sacrifice in correspondence with the Virāj[1]. The Virāj is food[2]. The food of the gods is king Soma[3]. Having made him food they give king Soma to the gods. When he is not pressed out, he is not food for the gods. Having made him food by pressing him out they give him to the gods. Whatever one does for the gods here on earth, that do the gods for him. Having become strengthened (with Soma) they strengthen him with offspring, cattle and food.

They say: "One should not sacrifice beyond the Virāj"[4]. He who sacrifices beyond the Virāj, remains sacrificing again in yonder world. He remains trying to make a correspondence with the Virāj as an emaciated[5] man wishing to obtain something, but not obtaining it. For where should he obtain it, when he leaves this world without having obtained[6] it? To some people who were sitting down there[7] like emaciated[5] men Asita, the son of Devala, once said: "Who are sitting there?" They said: "We are people who have sacrificed beyond the Virāj". To them he spoke:

234. "He falls from the chariot before the wheel, when there is a hole in the road[8]—and the wheel drives over him—, who performs a sacrifice which does not correspond (to the Virāj), the pious fool. What he gives, does not reach his[9] world (in heaven)"[10]. He meant to say to them: "Being fools you have honoured the gods without the right knowledge. You have sacrificed beyond the Virāj". As to this they say: "From where did you set up your sacrifice, where did you establish it?" One should say: "At the point wherefrom I set up[11] the sacrifice, I have established it". The sacrifice is set up from man, it is established in man.

Now king Hṛtsvāśaya Āllakeya of the Mahāvṛṣas (once) made his son become initiated (for a sacrifice). As his singer Somaśuṣma, the son of Satyayajña, was invited. To him (i.e. to Āllakeya) messengers of the Mahāvṛṣas came (and said:) "Come, there is a battle here". Then he said, when he drove away: "Udgātṛ, let me trust this son of mine to

you". He returned as a still ruling[12] king and said: "Udgātṛ, where did you place the sacrifice, where the sacrificer, where his cattle?" Then he did not answer. He (Āllakeya) said: "Again initiate my son, for we do not know where he put my son." They again initiated him. He (Āllakeya) acted himself as his Udgātṛ[13]. If he should have answered "I have placed the sacrifice in the sacrificer[14], the sacrificer in the Vāmadevya[15] and his cattle in the Rathantara[16]" (this would have been alright)[17].

235. The number ten represents the highest step of speech. So far is the highest point reached by speech in its course, (if one thinks:) "Let me reach all that which is the highest step of speech". And what is beyond it, twenty, hundred, thousand,[18] these are its limbs and members. This is the production of speech (i.e. that which originates from speech). And thereby one obtains here the whole Virāj. The tensyllabic metre Virāj forsooth agrees with man. There are ten vital powers in man.

Now follows the praise of these one hundred and ninety Stotra-verses. For the Agniṣṭoma consists of one hundred and ninety Stotra verses when it is chanted through to the end[19]. The number one hundred and eighty is the winning number (Kṛta)[20]; the winning number indeed is also ten since this number is perfect (*kṛta*)[21]. As to this the Kurus say: "The one hundred and ninety Stotra verses are the Dvāpara, the lowest of three throws[22] (i.e. the lowest except the Kali)". (The answer is:) "The Tretā and the Dvāpara belong to the same sphere as the Kṛta. (In the case of the one hundred and ninety Stotra verses, which divided by four have a remainder of two) the two remaining Stotra verses serve as additional praise. This is a winning Stoma (Kṛtastoma)[23]. With the Kṛta he thereby wins what he wants to win. With Kṛta one obtains a successful issue[24]. Moreover two Pavamānas here are (may be characterized as) wings (i.e. the first and the third). These two he thereby makes equal. And the sacrifice also becomes shining to all sides (actually to two sides). And it also has a double additional praise. These are the two tits of the Virāj. And the sacrificer has two feet in order to have a firm support."

236. As to this also a remark was made by Kahoḷa Kauṣītakeya[25]. "The Virāj of those who have the two Stotra verses as the tits of the Virāj, has indeed very long tits". "Then no doubt even the people of the neighbourhood do milk this Virāj"[26] he said. (The answer should be:) "The gods regarded this numeral equalization as based on syllables[27], so did the Seers, so do we also from generation to generation. In these one hundred and ninety Stotra verses there are five thousand four hundred and seventy-two[28] syllables. Only the last two syllables, number 5471 and 5472, form the tits of the Virāj[29]. And the sacrificer has two feet in order to have a firm support".

They say: "If the Stoma is a Dvāpara (i.e. having a remainder of two

verses after the total number of verses, 190, has been divided by four), how can it be a (winning) Kṛtastoma?"[23]. "By the syllables"[30]. "And by the number of Stotras"[31]. "And by the number of Stotras and Śastras"[32]. "And because the number ten is perfect (*kṛta*)", one should say; "thereby it is also a winning Stoma"[23]. In the form of a throw at the play of dice[33] the number ten arrives at the Kṛta.

237. In the beginning all here was water, a great ocean[34]. Then the supremacy belonged to the waters. This supremacy of the waters, the reign of the waters and the food of the waters were desired by Agni, who thought: "May this supremacy be mine, may this reign be mine, may this food be mine". He saw this equalization of the Agniṣṭoma (with these waters)[35]. Thereby he pushed these waters apart in two parts, the one part upwards, the other downwards[36]. Singing this (Agni) Stoma day by day[37] he made this food exclusively his own. With nine twenty-one-fold Stotras (= 189 verses) he propped yonder upper (waters). He surrounded them with embankments beyond heaven. They are these endiked waters which rain every (rainy) season. With twenty-one ninefold Stotras (= 189 verses) he took his stand upon these lower waters. He surrounded them with embankments beyond the earth. On these endiked waters people live; some dig[38] for them—

238. —others live upon still waters (from lakes), others from running waters (from rivers). Having pushed apart these waters and having removed them he ate the food in this world[39]. No food, small, middle or large so to say, was left for them. He who knows thus pushes away his hating rival in the same way and eats food in this world and no food, small, middle or large so to say is left for him (i.e. his rival). After he had won the food all the gods came to him. They did not find it[40]. For having added the twenty-first verse of the Yajñāyajñīya to these nine verses of the Bahiṣpavamāna he lies there as the (cosmic) snake Ananta and encloses the food[41]. Moreover like coals thrown in a vessel the food was invisible[42] in these worlds. To them who did not find (it) he spoke: "Praise me".

239. They, the Vasus, praised him with the Gāyatrī metre, with the Gāyatra Sāman and with the Morning Service. He invited them for this service (in order to give them food or rather Soma). The Rudras praised him with the Triṣṭubh metre, with the Traiṣṭubha Sāman and with the Midday Service. He invited them to this service. The Ādityas praised him with the Jagatī metre, with the Jāgata Sāman and with the Third Service. He invited them to this service. The All-gods[43], speech[44] and mind[45] and Prajāpati[45] praised him with the Anuṣṭubh metre, with the Yajñāyajñīya[43]. Then he invited them to this Stotra. In this way these gods became connected with his sacrifice. And those who remained unconnected,—

240. —they among the gods undoubtedly[46] perished through hunger. And those who did become connected, have remained here now and they also will not perish[47].

This Stoma is a Stoma for the All-gods. It used to be a Stoma of all the gods. Because they praised Agni with it, therefore it is called Agniṣṭoma. For they praised Agni with it. Him who knows thus, the own people and strangers praise with it; his own folks praise him abroad.

This (Agniṣṭoma) is equal to nine Twenty-onefolds[48] (and the number twenty-one is obtained by) twelve months, five seasons, these three worlds and the sun as the twenty-first. One Stotra verse forms the surplus[49]. The sacrificer or he who knows thus, is the surplus. He who knows thus, shines in the community in which he lives like the light may shine on a mountain.

It also amounts to twenty-one Ninefolds (Trivṛts). Agni is the Trivṛt[50]. Everything which is threefold (*trivṛt*) attains (*abhisampadyate*) Agni. And the great as well as the small[51] attainments attain him who knows thus. He (Agni) becomes established in yonder sun with twenty-one Trivṛts and yonder sun in him with nine Twenty-onefolds. Thus these two become established in each other[52]. He who knows thus, becomes firmly established.

241. Yonder one does not set, this one does not become extinguished. Yonder one goes home (*astam eti*) towards this one. Therefore this one (i.e. Agni) is at home (i.e. in this world). For yonder one goes home (sets) towards this one here. This one here goes out towards (or: visits) yonder one. Therefore yonder one belongs to yonder world. For this one visits yonder one (when he goes out). He who knows thus does not go down or go out.

These two deities are dwelling together. One obtains dwelling together with these two and they obtain dwelling together with him. They continuously remove all evil in these worlds.

As long as Agni here shines in this world, Āditya shines in yonder world. All that time the world of the one who knows thus is exempt from decay.

As in this world someone who has a house[53] may desire to obtain another house, so yonder waters above and these below, desire to obtain this world. That they do not[54] pass through is the doing[55] of this (Agni) Stoma. This Stoma keeps them apart[56]. He forsooth who is the saviour of one kingdom, and of two and of three, might on account of this think himself to have a good status[57]. He, however, will be completely a man of status[58] who will be one of those who are saviours of this world. He who knows thus (about the rescue of this world by means of the Agniṣṭoma) becomes one of the saviours of this world. Thereby[59] he obtains a good status. As long as there will be Brahmins who have

this knowledge, so long yonder waters and these waters both will not come together and destroy this world[60].

242. Of this Agniṣṭoma the Morning Service corresponds (*sampadyate*) to the Gāyatrī, the Midday Service to the Triṣṭubh and the Third Service to the Jagatī. This Morning Service has a natural correspondence; it is completely chanted with Gāyatrīs.

The Midday Service (consists of) four metres, the Gāyatrī, the Bṛhatī, the Kakubh and the Triṣṭubh. One adds 20 syllables of the 28-syllabic Kakubh to the (24-syllabic) Gāyatrī. That becomes equal to the (44-syllabic) Triṣṭubh. The remaining 8 syllables one adds to the (36-syllabic) Bṛhatī. That becomes equal to the (44-syllabic) Triṣṭubh. The Triṣṭubh is already a Triṣṭubh.

The third Service (consists of) six metres, the Gāyatrī, the Uṣṇih and the Kakubh, the Anuṣṭubh, the Jagatī and the Bṛhatī. Of the 24-syllabic Gāyatrī one adds 20 syllables to the (28-syllabic) Kakubh. That becomes equal to the (48-syllabic) Jagatī. The remaining 4 syllables one adds to the (28-syllabic) Uṣṇih. That becomes the 32-syllabic Anuṣṭubh. The Anuṣṭubh which is already present remains an Anuṣṭubh. Then one divides this into two halves. One adds 16 syllables to the (first) 32-syllabic Anuṣṭubh. That becomes equal to a (48-syllabic) Jagatī. The Jagatı is already a Jagatī. The remaining 16 syllables (of the first Anuṣṭubh) one adds to the (36-syllabic) Bṛhatī of the Yajñāyajñīya. That becomes equal to the 52-syllabic Jagatī. It exceeds the (real) Jagatī with 4 syllables. These are the four-feeted animals and the four tits which produce the Virāj[61] as their milk, and also the (fourfold) support, so that the four-feeted animal has a firm support. This (number of four syllables) afterwards disappears and nothing is left. One adds three (syllables) to the deficiency of the Vāmadevya[62],—

243. —one to the deficiency of the Yajñāyajñīya[63]. (Thus) the Morning Service becomes Gāyatrī-like, the Midday Service Triṣṭubh-like and the Third Service Jagatī-like. He who knows thus obtains glory as if he would be a Kṣatriya[64] and wealth and prosperity as if he would be a Vaiśya, though he is a Brahmin[65]. And for him the Morning Service agrees as to its syllables with the Gāyatrī, the Midday Service with the Triṣṭubh and the Third Service with the Jagatī. The Morning Service has 69[66] Stotra verses, the Midday Service has 60 Triṣṭubhs[67], the Third Service 24 Jagatīs[68]. And there is one Kakubh. Man is a Kakubh[69]. The sacrificer is placed on this correspondence. This also disappears afterwards and nothing is left. Having taken four syllables of the 28-syllabic Kakubh one adds three to the deficiency of the Vāmadevya[62] and one to the deficiency of the Yajñāyajñīya[63]. And the Gāyatrī which is left one adds to the 69 (Gāyatrī) verses of the Morning Service. This is again something endless[70]. He who knows thus wins endless glory.

244. Two of its Services (Pressings) have also a correspondence with the Bṛhatī. The Third Service is equal to what is before the Third Service. The Morning Service has 69 (24-syllabic Gāyatrī) verses. These are equal to 46 (36-syllabic) Bṛhatī verses. For two Bṛhatīs are three Gāyatrīs. These (separate verses) are not equal to 46 Bṛhatī verses. It is the Morning Service (itself) which during its course[71] becomes equal to the Bṛhatī. Because the Morning becomes equal to the Bṛhatı during its course, therefore the Brahmin[72] obtains his position by birth, but makes this (position) more or less important by his course of life (or conduct)[73].

The Midday Service is equal to two, namely the Udgātṛ and the Hotṛ The Udgātṛ employs four metres. The Hotṛ afterwards recites them and adds three metres, the Anuṣṭubh, the Paṅkti and the Jagatī. The (24-syllabic) Gāyatrī and the (48-syllabic) Jagatī are two (36-syllabic) Bṛahtīs. The (28-syllabic) Uṣṇih and the (44-syllabic) Triṣṭubh are two Bṛhatīs. The (32-syllabic) Anuṣṭubh and the (40-syllabic) Paṅkti are two Bṛhatīs. The Bṛhatī is already a Bṛhatī. Because these two (priests) correspond to the Midday Service, therefore the position of a Rājanya[74] must be made by sacrifices and liberality, faith in the effectivity of the Brahmins and their sacrifices and by friendliness towards Brahmins. And because the Third Service is equal to the preceding (two services), therefore also the Vaiśya is different from the Brahmin and the Rājanya as to his position[75]. For he does not occupy such a position as the Brahmin and the Rājanya.

V. 2. *The Bahiṣpavamāna; the Trivṛt Stoma* (245–250)

Auswahl, 96–98
JB. 1, 82–104; 315–321

245. The sacrificer is born to a prepared world. He wins the waters[1] with the first Stotra verse of the first tercet, the earth with the second verse, Agni with the third verse. He wins the intermediate world with the first Stotra verse of the second tercet, Vayu with the second verse, breath with the third. He wins heaven with the first Stotra verse of the third tercet, Āditya with the second verse and the stars with the third verse. These nine verses of the Bahiṣpavamāna become nine symbolic worlds[2]. These he obtains by means of them.

There are three Virājs here, the cosmic, the sacrificial and the human. About these Sucitta Śailāna held a discussion with Janaka, the King of Videha. He (Janaka) said: "The desire to sacrifice has come over me[3]. They should invite some priests for me". For him they brought priests from the country of the Kurus and Pañcālas. When they had arrived, Sucitta Śailāna feared: "He (Janaka) might show contempt of me like

travelling[4] Brahmins (do) who are driving along[5] among the peoples beyond the borders (of Aryan civilisation)[6]. He said: "I have a statement to make"[7]. "There are three Virājs here which become satiated[8], provide everything that one may wish and are called food. Him[9] who places you between them, you should choose for yourself as the Udgātṛ. He forsooth is the bringer of these objects of desire which are found with these (Virājs)[10]. And he who knows thus, is also the one who brings past repeated death."

246. Then he drove away. In view of him he (Janaka) did not[11] summon (the priests) to start the sacrifice, but asked them about the prosperity (obtained with the help) of these Virājs. They did not get[12] it and those who got it[13], got only one (of these Virājs)[14]. He (Janaka) remembered[15]: "I met a Brahmin, alas, a Brahmin, who was making investigations about these (Virājs). Run towards[16] Śailāna". The trick[17] worked exactly as Śailāna wished.

These three Virājs are cosmic, sacrificial and human. The cosmic Virāj consists of these worlds. There is something wanting in it. In order to place there the sacrificer, threfore there is something wanting in it. Herein he places the sacrificer. Of this (Virāj) the moon is the cover[18]. The moon evidently is the food of the gods[19].

And the sacrificial Virāj is the Bahiṣpavamāna. There is something missing in it. In order to place there the sacrificer, therefore there is something missing in it. Herein he places the sacrificer. Its cover is the Hiṃkāra. For with the (uttering of the) Hiṃkāra food is given to the gods at the end.

The human Virāj consists of the vital powers (or: breaths) in man. There is something missing in it. This (Virāj) is also evidently the sacrificer. Its cover is food.

These three Virājs are a navel. One obtains the objects of desire which are found with these (Virājs). One partakes of them here (in this life) and gets rid of repeated death[20]. He eats food together with many people in this world. For the food which is found with these (Virājs) is not for one man. Whatever animated being there is here in this world, for all that death keeps opening his mouth in order to swallow it. This death is the year[21]. His mouths are the seasons. For him who knows thus, whatever dies, does not die unseasonably. He who knows thus, becomes procreative with offspring and cattle whenever it is the right time.

247. There are nine (Gāyatrī) verses here in the Bahiṣpavamāna. They are (equal to) six Bṛhatī verses (as far as the total number of syllables is concerned). There are also six mouths of death, namely the seasons[22]. And only the Bṛhatī, and no other metre, is able to form a match for each of these mouths of death. By means of a Bṛhatī one covers the mouth of a season, by means of Bṛhatī[23] (the mouth) of

(another) season. As one may look back at something disagreeable after having passed it by means of something which neutralizes it, in the same way one looks back at this death after having left it far behind.

One hurls this Vajra in the form of a Trivṛt[24] at it (i.e. at death). It moves along these worlds day by day.

As to this Nagarin Jānaśruteya used to say: "There will be no war between gods and Asuras[25] as long as this threefold[24] (Trivṛt) Vajra moves along these worlds day by day. For this fire blazes upwards, the wind blows sidewards, yonder sun heats downwards. These look at each other without winking. How could there be a war between gods and Asuras as long as these are in this position?" And this threefold Vajra by moving along these worlds day by day also strikes off all evil for him who knows thus during its revolving movement[26].

248. As to this they say: "He may sacrifice now or act as a priest for someone else, who[27], while sacrificing with a sacrifice of four Stomas[28], sacrifices with a sacrifice which contains all Stomas. There are 9 Bahiṣpavamāna verses. They contain 27 verse quarters[29]. Thereby one does not exclude oneself from the twenty-seven-fold Stoma. There are 9 Bahiṣpavamāna verses. The Gāyatrī (the metre of the Bahiṣpavamāna) consists of 24 syllables. That is 33 (together). Thereby one does not exclude oneself from the thirty-three-fold Stoma. Thus one sacrifices with a fourfold Stoma (but includes the other Stomas).

He who knows the lowest Stoma as the highest, obtains the highest position. The ninefold forsooth is the lowest among the Stomas. The ninefold is (also) the highest (namely the thirty-three-fold Stoma, as was shown above). As to this Barku[30], the son of Vṛṣṇi, also said: 'I have seen the Ninefold as being the Thirty-threefold Stoma. Therefore I obtained the highest position". He who knows thus, obtains the highest position. But Āruṇi used to say: "Why should he who knows that day by day a threefold (Trivṛt), threepronged, perfect and unfailing Vajra moves along these worlds, bewitch[31] or mind being bewitched. Forsooth automatically bewitched is he, whom someone knowing thus hates, and he who hates someone who knows thus. And this same threefold, threepronged, perfect and unfailing Vajra, which day by day moves along these worlds, becomes directed towards him. There is for him no hope at all whatever small, of prosperity[32]; he gradually perishes.

249. As to this also Upajīva Khāḷāyana used to say: "I know this Trivṛt Stoma clearly. Therefore both he whom I hate and he who hates me become poorer day by day[33]". Agni is the Vajra of this world, Vāyu of the intermediate space and Āditya of heaven. This is microcosmically as follows[34]: Agni is speech, Vāyu is breath, Āditya is the eye. Therefore, when I speak to an adversary who hates me, when I breathe in his direction and when I look at him, then I hurl a Vajra at him. For him

there is no hope at all, whatever small, of superiorty[35]. And these powers also injure him who tries to injure him who knows thus.

And Śvetaketu Āruṇeya used to say: "I know the appearance of this Stoma as that of a white horse with black ears which is duly shown to the public[36]. So much splendid and so much beautiful it is. Therefore those who want to see me[37] in the forenoon (still) want to see me in the afternoon though I am someone who is really not nice to see[38]. I surely[39] never come across someone who uses his eyes".

As to this also Śāṭyāyani said: "What horse? Why (a limitation to) one single item? As the appearance and the splendour of this Agni, of this Vāyu and of yonder Āditya, thus is the appearance, thus is the splendour of this Stoma. The creatures here remain standing around[40] it and wishing to see it. Therefore those who know (this Stoma) and those who do not, all remain helplessly standing around it and wishing to see it in the Bahiṣpavamāna". Moreover these (verses) are also[41] the glory of other deities (than Agni, Vāyu and Āditya). These Bahiṣpavamāna verses are the concentrated power, force, essence and energy of these (other deities as well as of Agni, Vāyu and Āditya). He who thus knows this concentrated power, force, essence and energy of the deities, he comes into possession of power and force, glory and splendour.

250. Now they say: "Since a man wanting to sleep with a woman looks for a secret hiding-place and the other living beings, the animals, cover each other in the presence of each other (of the others), (one may ask) what is done in the ritual on account of which this is similar?". One should say[42]: "Because the Trivṛt Stoma (i.e. the Udgātṛ)in the Out-of-doors Laud goes away as it were from the altars (*dhiṣṇyas*, the altars of the other priests in the Sadas) and covers the Gāyatrī (metre used in the Out-of-doors Laud) after having crept away and the other priests remain sitting amidst the Dhiṣṇya altars, therefore the situation is similar". For man corresponds to the Trivṛt Stoma, the other living beings, the animals, to the Dhiṣṇya altars[43].

As to this they also say: "When the Trivṛt Stoma covers the Gāyatrī, what does she procreate on account of this?" One should say: "The sacrifice with seven naves[44] and the Iḍā as its end[45]". The Gāyatrī becomes pregnant. She procreates the Puronuvākya (invitation). The Puronuvākya the Yājyā[46], the Yājyā the Vaṣaṭ-call, the Vaṣaṭ-call the libations, the libations the Dakṣiṇās, the Dakṣiṇās heaven. Just as a river may quickly transport goods, even so these deities transport him with a view to heaven. The Trivṛt Stoma gives him to the Gāyatrī metre, the Gāyatrī metre gives him to the Puronuvākya invitation, the Puronuvākya invitation to the Yājyā, the Yājyā to the Vaṣaṭ-call, the Vaṣaṭ-call to the libations, the libations to the Dakṣiṇās, and the Dakṣiṇās make him go to heaven.

This is the sacrifice of seven naves with the Iḷā as its end. Its Trivṛt Stoma is a nave, the Gāyatrī is a nave, the Puronuvākya is a nave, the Yājyā is a nave, the Vaṣaṭ-call is a nave, the libations are a nave, the Dakṣiṇā is a nave. To him who knows thus the sacrifice becomes favourable.

V. 3. *The Fifteen-, Seventeen-, Twenty-one-fold Stomas of the Jyotiṣṭoma and their sampads* (251–252)

251. The Ājya lauds are fifteenfold Stomas. There are fifteen nights in the half-month of the waxing moon. This he thereby obtains. There are ten fingers[1] and four thighs-and-knees; what is above the navel, that is the fifteenth. This he adds here.

The Midday (Pavamāna) laud is a fifteenfold Stoma. There are fifteen nights in the half-month of the waning moon. This he thereby obtains. There are ten toes[1] and four thighs-and-knees; what is below the navel, that is the fifteenth. This he adds here.

The Pṛṣṭha lauds are seventeenfold Stomas. There are twelve months and five seasons. This he thereby obtains. There are ten fingers and seven vital powers[2] in the head. That makes seventeen. This he adds here.

The Ārbhavapavamāna laud is a seventeenfold Stoma. There are twelve months and five seasons. This he thereby obtains anew. There are ten toes[1], four thighs-and-knees and three downward airs[3]. That makes seventeen. This he adds here.

The Agniṣṭoma is a twenty-one-fold Stoma. There are twelve months, five seasons, three[4] worlds here and yonder sun is the twenty-first. This he thereby obtains. There are ten fingers and ten toes. The body is the twenty-first. This he adds here.

252. Knowing thus one places oneself in the nights and days, the half-months, the months, the seasons, the year, in all this, and one passes the death which is in heaven (i.e. the Punarmṛtyu). He who knows thus does not die again. His bones are formed of Ṛcs, his flesh of Sāmans. He who has repelled evil, shaken off the body and passes (death), shakes off this death in the form of his (own) body.

There are two Virājs, the divine and the human. The sun shines raised above these two. There are four regions, four intermediate regions and two worlds[5]. This is the divine (or: cosmic) (tenfold) Virāj. And now the human (or rather microcosmic) one. There are four eaters and six which are eaten. The Brahmin, the Rājanya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra are eaters, the cow, the horse[6], the goat, the sheep, rice and barley are those who are eaten. Raised above these the sun shines. Therefore there

is no heat and no cold (for him). He (the sun) is not hungry or thirsty. There is no lack of subsistence for him[7].

V. 4. *The parallelism of the Agniṣṭoma and the human body* (253–256)

253. When the Udgātṛ sings the Out-of-doors laud he emits the sacrificer here who has become seed. With the Retasyā he produces his mind[1], with the Gāyatrī verse his breath, with the Triṣṭubh verse his sight, with the Jagatī verse his hearing, with the Anuṣṭubh verse his speech[1]. With the Paṅkti verse he adds the self (*ātman*). And the last threefold strophe is the birth[2]. Thereby he generates him.

Because it is sung with much sound and trampling[3] as it were, therefore children are born with sound and trampling as it were. Now they also say: "It should be sung without sound. When the mother becomes wounded during the parturition, she makes sound[4]. But it may also happen that she brings forth softly and without making sound as it were, and with great joy[5]. And the Gāyatra Sāman means truth. One would disturb its success, if[6] one should practise something which belongs to the kind of the Rathantara Sāmañ[7] (and thereby become untrue). Therefore it (the Gāyatram) should be sung without making noise."

And then comes the Ājya laud dedicated to Agni, which is sacred to one deity. This is the arrival (of the child).[8] Thereupon the Ājya laud dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa. That is sacred to two deities. That is the becoming established (literally: the firm footing on two feet). Then the Ājya laud to Indra, which is sacred to one deity. That is the arrival. Then the Ājya dedicated to Indra and Agni. That is sacred to two deities. That is the arrival (since it is dedicated to Agni, resp. to Indra) as well as the becoming established (since it is dedicated to both deities at the same time)[8]. He who knows thus becomes firmly established.

Man gets a firm (twofold) footing in this world by means of the Trivṛt and the Fifteenfold Stoma. What one obtains is the Trivṛt, it is the Fifteenfold Stoma by which one gets firm support. There are two things which both are Trivṛts, there are two things which both are Fifteenfold Stomas. The Trivṛt Stoma is lustre and the glory of a Brahmin scholar, the Fifteenfold Stoma is might and power. Having reached firm support by means of might and power he who knows thus obtains lustre and the glory of a Brahmin scholar.

254. The Mādhyaṃdinapavamāna laud has the Gāyatrī metre. This is the downward air. There are two Sāmans which are chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre)[9]. Therefore one does two things with this air.

One produces faeces[10] and breaks wind. The two Prastāvas[11] and the two Finales are something different and the Hiṃkāra is in between. Therefore the one should not make a similar trill[12] as the other, and that one not a similar trill as the first. For thereby this is kept apart (like faeces and wind).

Then the Bṛhatī (in the Mādhyaṃdinapavamāna). This is the forward air. There are two Sāmans which are chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre). Therefore one does two things with this air. One emits seed and one urinates[13]. The two Prastāvas and the two Finales[11] are something different and the Hiṃkāra is in between. Therefore the one should not make a similar trill as the other, and that one not a similar trill as the first. For thereby this is kept apart (like seed and urine).

Then the Triṣṭubh. That is the navel. There is one Sāman which is chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre)[14]. Therefore one does only one thing with this vital air, i.e. when one breathes up, one's navel correspondingly breathes up.

Then the Pṛṣṭhas. The Pṛṣṭha lauds are Indra's force[15]. Therefore those who have the backbone of a cow, a horse or of a man have the strongest backbones. The Pṛṣṭhas ("the backs") are Indra's force. They are (chanted) on (verses composed in) the Bṛhatī metre. Therefore the ribs which are so to say extended or raised (*bṛhatīs)*—the vertebrate animals are raised (*bṛhatīḥ)* as it were—meet at the backbone (*pṛṣṭha)*[16].

Then the Gāyatrī of the Ārbhavapavamāna. This is this breath. There are two Sāmans[17] which are chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre). Therefore one does two things with this vital air. One exhales and inhales. The two Prastāvas are different, the two Finales are different, and the Hiṃkāra is in between. Therefore the one should not make a similar trill as the other and that one not a similar trill as the first. For thereby this is kept apart (like exhalation and inhalation).

Then the Uṣṇih and the Kakubh. They are the two eyes. The metre (of the Uṣṇih and Kakubh verses) is the same (as far as the total number of syllables is concerned, namely 8 + 8 + 12 and 8 + 12 + 8). There are two Sāmans[18]. Therefore the two eyes see the same. Both are based on verses of three Pādas. Therefore the eye consists of three parts, the white, the black and the pupil[19]. They are based on two excellent[20] verses. Therefore man sees excellently. The two Prastāvas are different, the two finales are different, the Hiṃkāra is in between. Therefore the strength of both eyes is different.

Then the Anuṣṭubh (in the Ārbhavapavamāna). That is speech[21]. There are two Sāmans which are chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre)[22]. Therefore one does two things with (the opening connected with the vital power) speech. One eats food and speaks. The two

Prastāvas are different, the two finales are different, the Himkāra is in between them. Therefore one does not speak the complete truth with speech, nor the complete untruth. For thereby it is kept apart.

Then the Jagatī. That is hearing[23]. There is one Sāman which is chanted on (verses composed in) this (metre)[24]. Therefore one does only one thing with this ear, namely one listens. It is based on a verse of four Pādas. Therefore one may remain in the same position and still hear all which comes from all the successive regions[25]. Even going away one hears what people are saying behind one's back.

Then the Yajñāyajñīya. That is the head[26]. The head is raised above the other limbs of the body. The Yajñāyajñīya is raised above the other lauds. He who knows thus becomes raised above the other people of his own clan. For the head here is above the other limbs. The Yajñāyajñīya stands above the other lauds. He who knows thus stands above other people of his own clan.

This is clearly a sacrifice of which evil has been repelled. No one will produce evil for him (the sacrificer) by criticizing him. If someone would curse him with regard to the Bahiṣpavamāna, he should speak to this person: "Killing with the sacrifice I have made the seed of the sacrifice spilt. Your progeny will become without seed"[27]. If someone would curse him with regard to an Ājya laud that is sacred to one deity[28], he should speak to him: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the departure of the sacrifice. Having departed you will die among foreign people[29]". If someone would curse him with regard to an Ājya laud sacred to two deities[30], he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the support of the sacrifice. You will lose your support". If someone would curse him with regard to the Gāyatrī verse of the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna laud, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the downward air of the sacrifice[31]. Constipation[32] will kill you". Or he should speak: "Diarrhoea[33] will kill you". If someone would curse him with regard to the Bṛhatī verses of the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna Stotra, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have made the membrum virile[34] of the sacrifice. Obstruction of the urine will kill you". Or he might also speak: "You will become seedless". If someone would curse him with regard to a Triṣṭubh verse of the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna Stotra, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the navel[35] of the sacrifice. A disease of the bowels will kill you". If someone would curse him with regard to the Pṛṣṭha Stotras, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the strength[36] of the sacrifice. A Vajra will kill you". Or he might also speak: "An unknown[37] killer (or: sort of death) will kill you".

255. If someone would curse him with regard to the Gāyatrī verse of the Ārbhava Pavamāna, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I

have produced the breath[38] of the sacrifice. Your lifebreath will leave you". Or he also might say: "You will become dying away". If someone would curse him with regard to the Uṣṇih and Kakubh verses (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna) he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the two eyes of the sacrifice. You will become blind". If someone would curse him with regard to the Anuṣṭubh verse (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna), he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the speech[39] of the sacrifice. Your speech will leave you". Or he might also say: "You will die of hunger[40]". If someone would curse him with regard to the Jagatī verse (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna), he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the hearing[41] of the sacrifice. You will become deaf". If someone would curse him with regard to the Yajñāyajñīya, he should speak: "Killing with the sacrifice I have produced the head[42] of the sacrifice. Your head will burst asunder[43]".

256. These are the answers. He who knows thus does not meet with injury relating to the sacrifice. He who criticizes him meets with injury. If someone would criticize him, he should speak to him: " I know this sacrifice as full, complete, with nothing missing from head to foot. If you know something deficient in it, I cover this opening with you as the lid". He who criticizes someone who knows thus meets with injury.

V. 5. *The circular structure of the Agniṣṭoma* (256–258)

Auswahl, 98–100; Falk, *Würfelspiel*, 125; Bodewitz, "Virāj and Kṛta in Sāmavedic ritualistic arithmetics", *ABORI* 68 (1987), 207–214.

256 (continued). Prajāpati, being the Agniṣṭoma, transferred the twenty-first verse of the Yajñāyajñīya to the nine verses of the Out-of-doors laud[1] and he was laying there milking the (five) Virājs with two tits, namely the five Fifteenfolds and the five Seventeenfolds[2]. These are five 32-syllabic Virājs. He who knows thus milks all wishes from the Virāj. For him who knows thus the sacrifice does not[3] melt away when he speaks untruth. For the sacrifice of someone who speaks untruth melts away and becomes putrid, but for him who knows thus the sacrifice does not melt away and become putrid. Therefore the Kurus and Pañcālas milk an animal (i.e. a goat) with two tits[4], for she belongs to Prajāpati. Therefore also the others[5], the peoples living outside the borders of Aryan culture[6], do not[7] milk (her). For they do not know her. Therefore also the others, the peoples living outside the border of Aryan culture, are so to say more suffering from hunger.

Prajāpati here in the form of the Agniṣṭoma—.

257. —having become circular and endless was laying there (like the cosmical serpent Ananta)[8]. Following this example the other cosmic

powers also became round. The sun is round, the moon is round, heaven is round, the intermediate space is round, the earth is round, even the divine in man is round. Following this example[9] someone who knows thus wins round, great, endless lustre.

This sacrifice is directed upwards in agreement with man. Its Out-of-doors laud is the two feet, the Ājya Stotras are these four thighs-and-knees. The Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna laud with its three metres[10] is that which lies below the navel. The Pṛṣṭha Stotras are the back (*pṛṣṭhāni*). The Ārbhava Pavamāna Laud is this here and the Agniṣṭoma chant (i.e. the Agniṣṭoma laud, the Yajñāyajñīya) is this here[11].

As to this a Brahmin interrogated Nagari Dālbhya[12]: "What is the direction of the sacrifice?" He said: "Upwards, in agreement with man". Thus he spoke. He who knows thus that his sacrifice is being set up here upwards in himself, he goes upwards, rising (i.e. thriving) with offspring and cattle. And he who knows it as reverted, becomes someone with reverses in his prosperity[13]. For him the Out-of-doors laud is this here[14] (namely the head), the Ājya Stotras are this here, the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna this here, the Pṛṣṭha Stotras are the back (*pṛṣṭhāni*), the Ārbhava Pavamāna laud is this here, the Yajñāyajñīya (i.e. the last Stoma) is the pair of feet. He becomes someone with reverses in his prosperity[13]. He who thus knows how these two sacrifices are set up in himself, for him the two sacrifices become favourable.

258. About this there is the following verse: "What is its beginning that is its end, what is its end is its beginning. Just as in the case of the creeping of a snake I do not discern which of the two (ends) is the beginning of Śākalya's ritual"[15].

Śakala, the descendent of Gopa, once was measuring out the sacrifice. He did not discern which of the two (extremities) was the beginning, which of the two the end, which of the two the smallest, which the broadest. As to this they say: "On what side is the smallest part of the sacrifice?" (The answer is:) "Where is the broadest part". "On what side is the broadest part?" "Where is the smallest part". Forsooth on the side of the Bahiṣpavamāna the sacrifice is the smallest. Thereby he meant to say here the feet, for man is the smallest on the side of the feet. He is also the broadest there, for he goes by feet. "Where is it the broadest?" "Where it is the smallest". Forsooth on the side of the Yajñāyajñīya the sacrifice is the smallest. Thereby he meant to say here the head, for man is the smallest on the side of the head. He is also the broadest there, for he looks with the eyes. As to this they say: "If the sacrifice should be set up upwards, only the gods would live upon it and not the human beings. If it should be set up downwards, only the human beings would live upon it, not the gods". The sacrifice is set up upwards as well as downwards, but also sidewards. If they should ask

about this: "What is the direction of the sacrifice?" one should say: "Upwards", but also "Downwards" and also "Sidewards". One should say: "To all directions". For him who knows thus the sacrifice is set up in all directions.

The Kurus and the Pañcālas once disputed about a ritualistic-cosmic problem. Then they came across a dog which was laying down curled up. They said: "The decision about our victory should depend on this'. The Pañcālas asked the Kurus: 'What of this is like something belonging to the sacrifice?. They did not answer. Then Vāsiṣṭha Caikitāneya said: "Just as yonder one (Prajāpati) lies down there[16] having transferred that twenty-first verse of the Yajñāyajñīya to the nine verses of the Out-of-doors laud, even so this one lies down here having put together both extremities. Since on account of this way of lying down this one obtains the form of this sacrifice, therefore you should keep alive this one although he is worthless[17]. Thereby they won.

V. 6. *The Out-of-doors laud: the modifications at the singing of the Gāyatrī verses called Dhūrs* (259–273)

Auswahl, 101–106
JB. 97–104; 315–321; PB. 7, 1; ṢaḍvB. 2, 1–3

259. The sacrificer is born twice; once he is born as a result of cohabitation, the other time he is born out of the sacrifice. When he is born from cohabitation, then he is born for this world, and when he is born out of the sacrifice, he is born for yonder world, for the world of the Gandharvas, for the world of the gods and for the world of heaven[1].

The sacrificer is the sacrifice[2], king Soma is the sacrifice. When they press out[3] king Soma with the pressing stones in the Havirdhāna, they thereby produce seed in the form of the sacrificer.

The Udgātṛ priest is Prajāpati[4]. He is (also) Tvaṣṭṛ, the one who emits the seed (*retas*), the maker of forms. When he chants the Retasyā verse in the Out-of-doors laud, he thereby emits the sacrificer in the form of seed[5]. If he should sing an Ṛc verse without a Sāman, there would be produced just flesh, no bones. He sings an Ṛc verse 'smeared' with Sāman. Therefore one is borne smeared with hair, skin and flesh[5].

He should not make the Hiṃkāra in this (Retasyā verse). If he should make the Hiṃkāra, he would split the seed with the Hiṃkāra which is a Vajra[6]. Even if one should approach it with a hair, one would split it[7]. He should sing this (Retasyā verse) with full concentration. If he should not sing it with full concentration, the children would be born without seed (i.e. impotent). Children are born without seed in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ.

260. He sings the Gāyatrī verse. The Gāyatrī is breath. He intertwines two of its syllables. Thereby he intertwines inhalation and exhalation. Therefore exhalation and inhalation mutually intertwined go to and fro inside the creatures with unweakened strength. He sings this (Gāyatrī verse) with full concentration. If he should not sing it with full concentration, dead children would be born. Dead children are born in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ.

He sings the Triṣṭubh verse. The Triṣṭubh is sight. He makes two of its syllables manifest. Thereby he places the two eyes. Therefore the two eyes are yoked as it were as a couple. He should sing it with full concentration. If he should sing it without full concentration blind children would be born. Blind children are born in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ.

He sings the Jagatī verse. The Jagatī is hearing. He makes four of its syllables manifest. Thereby he places the hearing: two cavities of the ear and two shells of the ear. Therefore remaining on one and the same place one hears (the sounds of) all the respective quarters of space. Even going away one hears people speak behind (oneself). He should sing it with full attention. If he should sing it without full attention, deaf children would be born. Deaf children are born in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ.

He sings the Anuṣṭubh verse. The Anuṣṭubh is speech. He sings pushing against it so that it turns in this direction in order that speech may not run away. If he should sing pushing it away so that it turns away, he blows away speech. Speech would run away from him. When he sings pushing against it so that it turns in this direction, he thereby places speech in himself. He sings two of its Pādas expressed (*nirukta*) and unexpressed (*anirukta*). People eat with the expressed part of speech; its unexpressed part is something to live on. He who knows thus eats with (the opening used for) speech and lives upon it. If he should sing expressedly, the creatures would speak and not be silent. And if he should sing unexpressedly, the creatures would be silent and not speak. Because he sings two Pādas expressedly and unexpressedly, therefore the creatures speak and remain silent.

261. He should sing this (Anuṣṭubh verse) forcefully[8], accompanied with trampling[9] and making a beat. For the Anuṣṭubh is forsooth a metre which strikes down as it were. By means of the Anuṣṭubh, which is speech, the gods drove away the Asuras who were without speech. If one sings this (Anuṣṭubh verse) forcefully, accompanied with trampling and making a beat—the evil is the rival—then one thereby drives away the evil in the form of the rival who has nothing to say[10] and obtains glory oneself. He should sing it with full attention. If he should sing it

without full attention, tongueless (dumb) children would be born. Tongueless (dumb) children are born in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ.

He sings the Paṅkti verse. The Paṅkti is the seasons[11]. He sings it stretched out (i.e. developing) into a Gāyatrī[12]. Therefore children are born stretched out[13]. He should sing it with full attention. If he should sing it without full attention, the children would prematurely come out. Children prematurely come out in the track of an incompetent Udgātṛ. And because this is the last strophe consisting of three verses, therefore it means birth. Thereby one brings forth.

The Retasyā is mind, the Gāyatrī verse breath, the Triṣṭubh verse sight, the Jagatī verse hearing and the Anuṣṭubh verse speech[14]. He who sings the Udgītha knowing that the mind is the Retasyā, from him is produced someone who is magnanimous (*mahāmanas*) and wise (*manasvin*). [And if he sings the Udgītha knowing that breath is the Gāyatrī, from him also is born someone who is magnanimous and wise.][15]. And he who sings the Udgītha knowing that the breath is the Gāyatrī, reaches his full lifetime. And also he who is born from him reaches a full lifetime. And if he sings the Udgītha knowing that sight is the Triṣṭubh, there is born from him someone who is not shame-faced[16], is seeing with good (in)sight[17] and is good-looking. And if he sings the Udgītha knowing that hearing is the Jagatī, there is born from him someone who is obedient, versed in the Śruti[18], worth to be heared. And if he sings the Udgītha knowing that speech is the Anuṣṭubh there is born from him someone who is a reciter[19], an Udgātṛ, successfull in speech[20],—

262. —a civilized man.

For thus the Kurus and the Pañcālas knew. Therefore among the Kurus and Pañcālas a hero is born together with (sons who are) all heroes. And when formerly the peoples living on the borders of Aryan civilization[21] did not know thus, therefore no hero was born with (sons who were) all heroes among the people living on the borders of Aryan civilizations. And when people knowing thus came to live among the peoples on the borders of Aryan civilization and act for them as priests, thence onward a hero is born with (sons who are) all heroes among the peoples on the borders of Aryan civilization.

The Kurus and the Pañcālas held a debate on cosmological and theological questions. The Pañcālas asked the Kurus: "What did we do here in the sacrifice by which among us a hero is born with (sons who are) all heroes?" They did not answer. Thereby they were victorious over them. They should have answered[22]: "Because we know thus (as described above in our text) and people knowing thus act as our priests, therefore a hero with (sons who are) all heroes is born." From him who

knows thus a hero with (sons who are) all heroes is born.

Now they say: "Should the Dhūrs be chanted on various metres or not?"[23]. "They should be chanted on various metres" say—

263. —the Kurus.

"The Morning service is connected with the Gāyatrī, the Midday service with the Triṣṭubh and the Third service with the Jagatī. The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this[24]. When during the Morning service which is connected with the Gāyatrī, one sings a Gāyatrī verse—the Gāyatrī is the Brahmin class, the Morning service is the Brahmin class—one thereby places the Brahmin class in its own proper place[25].

When one sings a Triṣṭubh verse—the Triṣṭubh is the Kṣatriya class and these are luxuries used in the Kṣatriya class, namely elephants and golden ornaments for the neck, a chariot with a she-mule, a chariot with a horse, a golden ornament for the breast and a golden cup[26]—one thereby offers these to the Brahmins and decorates them therewith.

When one sings a Jagatī verse—the Jagatī is the Vaiśya class and these are the luxuries current among the Vaiśyas, namely cows and horses, elephants and gold, goats and sheep, rice and barley, sesam and beans, clarified butter, milk, wealth and comfort—one thereby offers these to the Brahmins and decorates them therewith.

The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this. When one sings an Anuṣṭubh verse—the Anuṣṭubh is the Śūdra class—one thereby takes all this from the Śūdras, offers it to the Brahmins and decorates them therewith.

264. Just as one may shatter (the contents of) a quiver[27] by means of (repeated) shaking[28], so one offers all these luxuries to the Brahmins and decorates them therewith. Therefore they (i.e. the Dhūr-verses) should be sung on various metres."

Since the time that they are sung here on different metres, since that time the Brahmins here are powerful over the others. And when they did not sing these (Dhūr-verses) on various metres, the Brahmins were persons to be pillaged[29]. Satyayajña, the descendant of Puluṣa, ...[30]. And since these (Dhūr-verses) are sung on various metres, since that time these luxuries come to the Brahmins.

He sings the Gāyatrī at the beginning and at the end. The Gāyatrī is Brahman[31]. Therefore these luxuries enclosed on both sides by the Brahman serve him who knows thus.

The Pañcālas said: "They should not be chanted on various metres". The Dhūrs are naturally already chanted on various metres. One rises to heaven singing them on various metres on account of the correspondence with the (three) pressings. And if a bad report accompanies them saying: "They have chanted on various metres", (one should remark)

"Those two who fight and those two who have a quarrel have sung on various metres, and also those two parties that make a scission in the kingdom"[32].

265. The Morning service is connected with the Gāyatrī, the Midday service with the Triṣṭubh, the Third service with the Jagatī. The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this. In that he sings a Gāyatrī verse during the Morning service which is connected with the Gāyatrī,—the Gāyatrī is the Brahmin class—he thereby gives the Brahmin class a share in the property of the Brahmins. To someone who wants to take something from him he is willing to give it. Moreover it is his (own). For he presents him with his own (property).

And when he sings a Triṣṭubh verse—the Triṣṭubh is the Kṣatriya class—he thereby causes the Kṣatriya class to take share in the property of the Brahmins. To someone who wants to take something from him he is willing to give it. Moreover it is his (own). For he presents him with his own (property).

And when he sings on a Jagatī verse—the Jagatī is the Vaiśya class—he thereby causes the Vaiśya class to take share in the property of the Brahmins. To someone who wants to take something from him he is willing to give it. Moreover it is his (own). For he presents him with his own (property).

The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this. And when he sings an Anuṣṭubh verse—the Anuṣṭubh is the Śūdra class—then he gives the Śūdras a share in the property of the Brahmins. To someone who wants to take something from him he is willing to give it. Moreover it is his (own). For he presents him (the Śūdra) with his own (property).

When everything is manifest[33] (and no Gāyatrī is to be chanted as a Triṣṭubh etc.), then no one desires to take something (from the Brahmin class) by folly. Therefore they (the Dhūr-verses) should not be sung on various metres. Since the time that they are sung here on various metres, since that time the Brahmins are deprived of property[34]. And when they did not sing these (Dhūr-verses) on various metres, the Brahmins were no more to be overpowered[35].

266. The Morning service is connected with the Gāyatrī, the Midday service with the Triṣṭubh, the Third service with the Jagatī. The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this. When one sings the Morning service, which is connected with the Gāyatrī, completely with the Gāyatra Sāman, then one sets aside a selected exclusive portion for the Brahmin class. A selected exclusive portion for the Brahmin class is set aside by him.

When one begins[36] the Midday service, which is connected with the Triṣṭubh, with the Gāyatra Sāman, then one gives the Brahmin a share

in the wealth of the Kṣatriya. He becomes willing to give on account of religious zeal, because it is his duty to do so and out of courteousness. When a Kṣatriya is struck by religious zeal, forsooth then he chooses him and gives presents to him.

When one begins[36] the Third service, which is connected with the Jagatī, with the Gāyatra Sāman, then one gives the Brahmin a share in the wealth of the Vaiśya. He becomes willing to give to him on account of religious zeal, because it is his duty to do so and out of courteousness. When a Vaiśya is struck by religious zeal, forsooth then he chooses him and gives presents to him.

The Anuṣṭubh forms the correlate of (all) this. When one sings on an Anuṣṭubh verse—the Anuṣṭubh is the Śūdra class—, then one gives the Brahmin a share in the wealth of the Śūdra. He wants to give to him on account of religious zeal, because it is his duty and out of courteousness. When a Śūdra is struck by religious zeal, forsooth then he will choose him and give to him. He (i.e. the Brahmin Udgātṛ) makes his wealth exclusively his own, he gets a share in the wealth of the Kṣatriyas and of the Vaiśyas. He obtains a safe, sheltered position and is not crushed between two rival parties[37]. Hundred servants or even more serve him[38] who knowing thus does not sing the Dhūrs on different metres. If someone were to sing them on different metres, he should sing them knowing what has been observed there (i.e. in the preceding chapters) (*ado vidvān*). And if he were not to sing them on different metres, he should not sing them on different metres knowing what has been observed here (*idaṃ vidvān*). He who knows only either of the two, suffers distress[39]". Thus spoke Śāṭyāyani.

267. He sings the Retasyā verse. Thereby he emits seed. This emitted seed he causes to grow up with the Gāyatrī, a longer metre (a verse consisting of longer Pādas). Then he causes it to grow with a Triṣṭubh, a longer metre. Then he causes it to grow with the Jagatī, a longer metre. Because he causes it to grow with a longer and longer metre[40], therefore someone who grows gets more and more force.

With the Anuṣṭubh, a shorter metre, he comes to a conclusion of the growth[41]. Therefore one becomes more and more short[42] in old age. He comes to a conclusion with the Paṅkti metre. Therefore the differentiation of the embryo takes place in the fifth month[43]. With the Anuṣṭubh, (which is identical with) speech (*vāc*) he comes to a conclusion. Therefore people listen to the speech of an old man[44].

The Out-of-doors laud is the head of the sacrifice. This is so. But (the first verse of the Out-of-doors laud in the differentiation of the Dhūrs) the Retasyā is also the whole body. When in the Out-of-doors laud—

268. —he sings the Gāyatrī—the breath is connected with the Gāyatrī

and the Gāyatra Sāman (which is chanted throughout the Out-of-doors laud) is the head: the head is the proper place of breath—, then he puts the breath in its own proper place[45].

He sings the Triṣṭubh. The Triṣṭubh is the sight. Having taken it then he fastens (lit. yokes) it to the head. Because he yokes it, therefore the sight forms a yoke as it were. He fastens it (there) although it has its proper place elsewhere[46]. Therefore even during one's lifetime the sight begins to disappear.

He sings the Jagatī. The hearing is the Jagatī. Having taken it then he fastens it to the head. Because he yokes it, therefore the hearing is yoked as it were. He fastens it (there) although it has its proper place elsewhere[46], namely at the Third Service. Because he fastens it (there) although its proper place is elsewhere, therefore the hearing begins to disappear even during one's lifetime.

He sings the Anuṣṭubh. Speech is the Anuṣṭubh. Having taken it then he fastens it to the head. Because he yokes it, therefore speech is yoked as it were[47]. He fastens it (there) although it has its proper place elsewhere, namely at the third service or everywhere[48]. Because he fastens it (there) although its proper place is elsewhere, therefore speech begins to disappear already even during one's lifetime. The other vital powers disappear, but not breath.

269. Now they say: "What is done here in the sacrifice on account of which during one's lifetime the other vital powers disappear, but not breath?" One should say: "Because one sings the Gāyatrī at its own proper place, therefore breath does not disappear as long as one lives".

And now the means of knowing (*vijñā*)[49] and the means of mutual understanding (*saṃjñā*) connected with the Dhūrs. The Retasyā verse is the mind, the Gāyatrī verse the breath (in the nose), the Triṣṭubh verse the sight, the Jagatī verse the hearing, the Anuṣṭubh verse the (opening in the head connected with the sense-function) speech (i.e. taste). With the mind one discerns what is benevolent or malevolent[50]. With the breath (in the nose, i.e. with the smell) one discerns what is sweet-smelling or evil-smelling. With the eye one discerns what is good-looking or bad-looking. With the hearing one discerns what is harmonious or inharmonious. With the (mouth, i.e. the opening connected with) speech (i.e. with the tongue, with taste)[51] one discerns what is sweet or tasteless. These are the means of knowing[52]. He who knows thus becomes discerning and obtains a superior position.

These same are also means of mutual understanding. The Retasyā verse is the mind, the Gāyatrī verse the breath, the Triṣṭubh verse the sight, the Jagatī verse the hearing and the Anuṣṭubh speech. When the Retasyā verse has been chanted,—

270. —he should concentrate with his mind on the mind of him whose

mind he likes. When the Gāyatrī verse has been chanted, he should concentrate with his smell on the smell of him whose smell he likes. When the Triṣṭubh verse has been chanted, he should concentrate with his sight on the sight of him whose sight he loves. When the Jagatī verse has been chanted, he should concentrate with his ear on the ear of him whose ear he loves. When the Anuṣṭubh has been chanted, he should concentrate with his taste on the taste of him whose taste he loves. These are the means of mutual understanding. He who knows thus is in harmony with him about whom desires: "May I be in harmony with him".

And he combines the divine Dhūrs with the human Dhūrs. The mind is a human Dhūr, waters[53] are a divine Dhūr. When the Retasyā verse has been chanted, he should combine the waters with the mind. Thereby he should assign the right place[54] to the mind in the interior of the sacrificer. The breath (or: smell) is the human Dhūr, wind is the divine Dhūr. When the Gāyatrī verse has been chanted he should combine the wind with the breath. Thereby he assigns the right place to the breath in the interior of the sacrificer. The eye is the human Dhūr, the sun is the divine Dhūr. When the Triṣṭubh has been chanted, he should combine the sun with the eye. Thereby he assigns the right place to the eye in the interior of the sacrificer. The ear is the human Dhūr, the quarters of space the divine Dhūr. When the Jagatī has been chanted, he should combine the quarters with the ear. Thereby he assigns the right place to the ear in the interior of the sacrificer. Speech is the human Dhūr, the earth the divine Dhūr[55]. When the Anuṣṭubh has been chanted, he should combine the earth with speech (or: the tongue). Thereby he assigns the right place to speech (or: taste) in the interior of the sacrificer. Thus the human and the divine Dhūr both become combined. Having thus combined the human and the divine Dhūrs he passes that death which is in heaven. Someone who knows thus does not die again. He joins himself with the deities.

271. And now the debate between the following great Brahmins: Āruṇi, Jīvala, Kārīrādi, Aṣāḍha and Sāvayasa and Indradyumna Bhāllaveya. Jīvala Kārīrādi and Indradyumna Bhāllaveya came to have a meeting[56] with Āruṇi, their teacher. They stayed overnight in the house of Aṣāḍha. Aṣāḍha said: "Well, Āruṇi, since we two together were pupils and practised the study of the Veda, (one may ask:) Whereby did you become more learned than we? Since you are so much the favourite of fame, so much dear to the eye and so much favoured by economic gain, (I ask you) whereby did you reach this?" He said: "I consider this to be based on the Dhūrs". "What is it that you see in these Dhūrs?" "The favourite". "What does he become who approaches the aspect of favouriteness in the Dhūrs?" "He becomes the favourite of fame, dear

to the eye and favoured by economical gain". "So are you" they said.

Then they said to Jībala Kārīrādi: "Since you are here the best[57] in that very country in which you happen to stay and even kings approach you as inferiors, (one may ask:) Whereby did you reach this?" He said: "I consider this to be based on the Dhūrs". "What is it that you see in these Dhūrs?" "The glory". "What does he become who approaches the aspect of glory in the Dhūrs?" "In every country where he may be, he becomes the best there and even the kings approach him as inferiors". "So are you" they said.

Then they said to Aṣāḍha Sāvayasa: "Since you are the chief[58] of the Śarkarākṣas[59] (we ask:) Whereby did you reach this?" He said: "I consider this to be based on the Dhūrs". "What is it that you see in the Dhūrs?" "Birth"[60]. "What does he become who approaches the aspect of birth in the Dhūrs?" "To whatever community of kinsmen he belongs, there he becomes a chief"[61]. "So are you" they said.

Then they said to Indradyumna Bhāllaveya: "Since here your renown becomes more and more elevated above (that of) the others and you are an authority, (we ask:) Whereby did you reach that?" He said: "I consider this to be based on the Dhūrs". "What is it that you see in the Dhūrs?" "Renown". "What does he become who approaches the aspect of renown in the Dhūrs?" "His renown becomes more and more elevated above (that of) the others and he becomes an authority". "So are you" they said.

They said: "If this is so, come, let us make a collective teaching[62]".

272. They said to Āruṇi: "You are our own teacher. You should speak first". He said: "I consider the Gāyatrī to be dear. The Gāyatrī is the breath and the breath is dear, for there is nothing dearer than the (life)breath. He who knows thus considers this Gāyatrī to be the dear, becomes dear to fame, dear to the eye and dear to economic gain just as the breath is dear to oneself".

Then Jāvala Kārīrādi said: "I consider the Triṣṭubh to be dear. The Triṣṭubh is the Kṣatriya class and the Kṣatriya class is glory. He who thus considers this Triṣṭubh to be the glory, he becomes the best in whatever country he may be and even kings approach him as inferiors".

Then Aṣāḍha Sāvayasa said: "I consider the Jagatī to be abundance and procreation. Among the metres the Jagatī represents abundance and procreation[63]. He who thus considers this Jagatī to be abundance and procreation, he becomes rich in offspring and cattle and to whatever community of kinsmen he belongs, there he becomes the chief".

Then Indradyumna Bhāllaveya said: "I consider the Anuṣṭubh to be renown[64]. He who thus considers this Anuṣṭubh to be renown, for him this speech, the Anuṣṭubh, renown continuously roams higher and higher above (that of) the others and he becomes an authority".

273. Thus they were each of them connected with one single (aspect of the Dhūrs). But he who knows all these as one and the same—for thus they are all one and the same—he becomes the best[65] among his own men at once.

As to this Vāsiṣṭha Caikitāneya said after he had learnt about it afterwards: "When these Brahmins were investigating about the Dhūrs, they did not understand the Dhūr on which all the Dhūrs are based". Thereby he meant to say the Retasyā. What they called the one Dhūr, that is the Retasyā which is the Dhūr of the Dhūrs[66]. That is food. Its preparation is based on the (other) Dhūrs[67]. The nice smell comes from the Gāyatrī. It[68] is nice to see on account of the Triṣṭubh. It[68] is praiseworthy (litt.: to be heard) on account of the Jagatī. When one makes an auspicious remark (about it) with speech[69], then that is based upon the Anuṣṭubh. He who causes them (the Dhūrs) to be furnished[70] with these (qualifications), makes them food. They being eaten make him an eater of food[71], the chief among his own people. An eater of food, the chief among his own people, becomes he who knows thus.

V. 7. *The Pavamānas* (274–279)

Auswahl, 106–108

274. The Pavamānas, Agni, Vāyu and yonder sun, are three oceans. The Udgātṛ should sing these in a veiled way[1]. At the moment when Prajāpati gives rain, (i.e.) food, to the creatures, then they become veiled. He here (i.e. the Udgātṛ) is Prajāpati[2]. When being about to sing he sings the Pavamānas in a veiled way[3], he veils the sacrificer with food, he veils himself, he veils his offspring. "Parjanya becomes raining much" said Kūṭa Śailana, "where I act as an Udgātṛ". "Where Parjanya becomes raining much, there the ox, the mule, the elephant, the golden neck-ornament[4] and man become beautiful. Forsooth, every beautiful form is produced there", knowing that he said this.

He who keeps separated the gods and the human beings, becomes separated from (i.e. gets rid of) evil[5]. The gods are the Pavamānas, the creatures the Pṛṣṭhas and the Ukthas. He should sing these Pavamānas in a veiled way, mysteriously and indistinctly, for the gods are so to say veiled, mysterious and indistinct. The creatures are the Pṛṣṭhas and the Ukthas. He should sing them in an unveiled way, openly and distinctly, for the human beings are so to say unveiled, open and distinct.

275. He who sings the Pavamānas, comes to a divine assembly. He should perform his chanting as someone who approaches a superior, wishing to be helpful as it were[6], offering his services as it were, paying homage[7] as it were, competent, not blundering[8] and with thoroughly performed Pavamānas. It is as if he would allure[9] someone who is

coming and would give to him what he asks. But if someone sings (Pavamānas which are) not thoroughly performed, incompetent and blundering[8], it is as if he would push back[9] someone who is coming and would not give what he asks. Hereby also the successful and the unsuccessful of the sacrifice is discerned.

The Pavamānas are a river to be crossed[10] here. He who passes a river to be crossed by diving into it[11] wrapped in his clothes[12], becomes smeared with clay or gets stuck in it, but he who crosses it by diving into it not being wrapped by clothes[12], he does not become smeared with clay and does not get stuck in it. Thus the Pavamānas should be performed.

Now they say: "Since the other Stotras have the Stotra-verse (of the corresponding Śastra) as their beginnings, (one may ask) why the Pavamānas do not have these Stotra verses (of the Śastra) as their beginnings"[13]. One should say: "The Pavamānas are the breaths, the Pavamāna verses are also the breaths. If now after the Pavamānas they should begin (the Śastras) with the opening-verses of the Pavamānas, they would wipe off the breaths without any possibility of return. In that they begin (the Śastras) after these (Pavamānas) with an Anuṣṭubh-verse—the Anuṣṭubh is speech, inbreathing is sustained during speech—thereby one maintains inbreathing by means of speech[14].

276. Now they say: "If they do not begin a Stotra with the beginning verse (of the corresponding Śastra), that Stotra is not sacred as it were. How does one achieve that there is no deviation from the (practice of the) Stotriya verse being the opening of Stotra and Śastra?" One should say: "The Anuṣṭubh is speech, on speech are based all the metres. In that the Pavamāna is sacred to Agni and to Indra, thereby there is no deviation from the (practice of the) Stotriya verse being the beginning of Stotra and Śastra[15].

The Pavamāna Stomas are named victory, for by the Pavamānas the gods defeated the Asuras rushing forward without turning back. That the Pavamānas rush forward without turning back[16], that is like the rushing forward without turning back of someone who is victorious. That they begin (the Śastra) with an Anuṣṭubh verse (instead of the opening verse of the corresponding Stotras—the Anuṣṭubh is speech and speech causes someone to speak; with speech one says: "Go ahead, defeat, attack, do not turn back"—that is like speaking: "Go ahead, defeat, attack, do not return".

The Pavamāna (Stotras) are the gods; they are the Stotras of the gods. The gods correspond to them[17]. The creatures are the Pṛṣṭha and the Uktha (Stotras)[18]. These are the Stotras of the creatures. The creatures correspond to them[19]. Because they praise with Pavamānas that do not turn back[16], therefore the gods do not turn back. The sun goes without

turning back, so does the moon, so do the stars, so does the fire when it moves burning. And because they praise with Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras that go forwards and backwards[20] therefore the creatures go forth and return along the same path: In the morning they come forth, in the evening they return[21]. Seed is emitted forward, it comes back when it is born as a child[22].

277. Pṛthu, the son of Vena, asked the divine Vrātyas: "The highest seat of the sacrifice, which is secret[23], is made out of the great space between heaven and earth. Why do the Pavamānas go forth? Why do the Ukthyas[24] come back roaring[25]?" They answered: "The gods live upon the one track of the sacrifice, the human beings upon the other. Therefore the Pavamānas go forth; therefore the Ukthyas come back roaring"[25]. He who knows that the gods have a share in the human beings and the human beings a share in the gods, gets a share in the gods as well as in the human beings. He goes to the world where the gods are. The deities do not leave him.

The Pavamānas are the gods, the Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras the creatures. The gods are the chant, the creatures the metrical verses. In that the chants of the Pavamānas go forth and this Ṛc[26] clutches at them from behind[27], thereby the gods have a share in the human beings. And in that the Sāman clutches from behind at the Ṛc that clutches at the returning (or: repeated) (Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras), thereby the human beings have a share in the gods. He who knows thus, gets a share in the deities and in the human beings. He goes to the world where the gods are. The deities do not leave him.

278. He who keeps separated the divine form and the human form, becomes separated from (i.e. gets rid of) evil[28]. The Pavamānas are the gods, the Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras are the creatures. Because they praise the Pavamānas on Pavamāna verses, therefore the gods have one colour, they are white. And because they praise with Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras based on verses of different form[29], dedicated to different deities, therefore on the other hand the creatures have different colours, they are white, red or black[30]. Thus he who knows thus separates the divine colour and the human colour and becomes separated from (i.e. gets rid of) evil.

He who knows the selection of the gods, obtains a selection himself and becomes select. The Out-of-doors laud forsooth is the selection of the gods. Thereby they praise with one Hiṃ-sound and running forth (i.e. without repetition). Therefore a selection is something which goes forth (i.e. which leaves the group to which it belongs). He himself is the best of the gods. His selection consists of children. He who knows thus takes a selection for Prajāpati (the lord of creatures) and becomes select.

Because one tears away[31] this essence of the sacrifice and gives it to Prajāpati, therefore people who are going to praise the Out-of-doors laud[32] move slowly (literally: creep) stooping (i.e. humble) and trembling[33]. This is the way in which the superior is served. Therefore one should not speak during its Stotra[34]. For who would dare to make a critical remark[35] on the serving up of a meal to a superior? If someone makes a critical remark on the serving up of a meal to a superior, he brings him to his knees with whatever sickness he wishes. And when afterwards the Adhvaryu pronounces the invitation, then having given the essence of the sacrifice to Prajāpati he causes it to swell. There is praised by him with this (Out-of-doors laud) which has an essence and is swollen.

279. He who knows the divine glory and the human glory reaches glory among the gods and among the human beings. The Pavamānas are the divine glory. They are the exhalation[36]. They announce him to the gods. The returning (i.e. repeated) verses are the human glory. They are the inhalation[37]. They announce him to the human beings. This is the divine and the human glory. He who thus knows the divine and the human glory reaches glory with the gods and with the human beings. For him who knows the measured (limited) and the unmeasured (unlimited), there is much measured as well as unmeasured. The Pavamānas are the gods, the Pṛṣṭha and Uktha Stotras are the creatures. The gods are the Sāman, the creatures the Śastras (recitations). Therefore all the gods here are also Stotras. Because the Stotras are limited therefore the gods are limited. There are eight Vasus, eleven Rudras and twelve Ādityas. And because the Śastras are unlimited, therefore the creatures are unlimited. We do not know how many Brahmins, how many Kṣatriyas, how many Vaiśyas and how many Śūdras there are. This is the limited and the unlimited. For him who knows thus there is much limited as well as unlimited.

(There is a verse)[38]: "Those that come hitherward they also call thitherward, those that go thitherward they also call hitherward. What things, O Soma, you and Indra made, they draw them as though yoked to the pole of space". The 'thitherwards' are the Pavamānas. Their Camasa cups are the 'hitherwards'. They (i.e. the Pavamānas) are these exhalations. Therefore one is able to inhalate after having exhalated. The 'hitherwards' are Stotras with the repeated verses (outside the Pavamānas). Their Camasa cups are the 'thitherwards'. They (i.e. the repeated verses) are these inhalations. Therefore one is able to exhalate after having inhalated.

V. 8. *The Metres* (280–290)

Auswahl, 108–117; Caland, *Over en uit*, 49–50
JUB. 1, 18

280. He who knows the precedence of the Pressings, reaches precedence and does not become deprived of precedence.

The Gāyatrī is the precedence of the Morning Pressing. Even though several other metres are used in it, it is called Gāyatra.

The Triṣṭubh is the precedence of the Midday Pressing. Even though several other metres are used in it, it is called Traiṣṭubha.

The Jagatī is the precedence of the Third Pressing. Even though several other metres are used in it, it is called Jāgata.

That is the precedence of the Pressings. He who thus knows the precedence of the Pressings, reaches precedence and does not become deprived of precedence.

He who knows the houses of the gods, obtains a house. The metres forsooth are the houses of the gods.

The Gāyatrī has eight syllables; there are eight Vasus. Through the Gāyatrī the Vasus possess a house.

The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables; there are eleven Rudras. Through the Triṣṭubh the Rudras possess a house.

The Jagatī has twelve syllables; there are twelve Ādityas. Through the Jagatī the Ādityas possess a house.

Through the Anuṣṭubh the All-gods[1] (possess a house), through the Pressings Indra and Agni[2].

He who thus knows these houses of the gods, obtains a house. He who knows the satisfactions of the gods, become satisfied himself and his offspring becomes satisfied.

281. As to this also Iyapi Saumāpa said: "He may sacrifice now or act as a priest for someone else, who would find all the deities satiating themselves on account of the fact that he had satisfied them each according to his own Pressing and to every syllable in the (corresponding) metres and (consequently) not[3] pressed together, just as one may satisfy cattle in a large ford without sandbanks[4], (i.e.) not pressed together.

The Gāyatrī has eight syllables. There are eight Vasus. The morning Pressing is connected with the Gāyatrī and belongs to the Vasus. Therefore they satiate themselves at the Morning Pressing, each according to every single syllable in the metres, since they are not[3] pressed together.

The Triṣṭubh has eleven syllables. There are eleven Rudras. The Midday Pressing is connected with the Triṣṭubh and belongs to the

Rudras. Therefore they satiate themselves at the Midday Pressing, each according to every syllable in the metres, since they are not[3] pressed together.

The Jagatī has twelve syllables. There are twelve Ādityas. The Third Pressing is connected with the Jagatī and belongs to the Ādityas. Therefore they satiate themselves at the Third Pressing, each according to every syllable in the metres since they are not[3] pressed together.

[Through the Anuṣṭubh the All-gods, through the Pressings Indra and Agni[5].]

He who thus knows these[6] satisfactions of the gods, becomes satisfied himself and his offspring becomes satisfied.

282. Therefore[7] wherever someone who knows thus sacrifices or[8] acts as a priest, the gods have no power over him that they would not[9] go (to his sacrifice). Whether they will be eating or not, they go. If[10] he is pure, they eat; if he is impure, they look on. It is also praiseworthy if they come to someone's house[11] as someone who takes a look[12].

He who knows the drinking-vessel of the gods, becomes among his own people worthy to partake of a meal. The Brahmin is the drinking-vessel of the gods. He who knows thus becomes worthy to partake of a meal among his own people. Just as they wish to drink from a pure and clean cup even so forsooth the gods wish to drink from a pure and clean cup. Therefore also the Brahmin should wish to be pure and clean.

283. [13]Prajāpati created the gods. After them the evil in the form of death[14] was created. The gods went to Prajāpati and said: "Wherefore did you create us, if you were planning to create the evil in the form of death after us?" He said to them: "Compose the metres (and) enter them each in your own abode. Then you will get rid of the evil in the form of death". The Vasus composed the Gāyatrī. They entered it. It gave them shelter. The Rudras composed the Triṣṭubh. They entered it. It gave them shelter. The Rudras composed the Triṣṭubh. They entered it. It gave them shelter. The Ādityas composed the Jagatī. They entered it. It gave them shelter[13]. The Sādhyas and the Āptyas composed the Aticchandas. They entered it. It gave them shelter.

284. Indra and Agni entered the Pressings. Then the evil in the form of death did not know them anymore, for how will the evil in the form of death have power over someone if he does not know him? The evil in the form of death will not find him who knows thus. The metres forsooth gave shelter against the evil in the form of death. Because the metres *(chandāṃsi)* gave shelter *(acchādayan)* to them against the evil of death, therefore the metres are called *chandāṃsi*. The metres give shelter against the evil of death to him who knows thus. Therefore whatever metre someone who knows thus uses as a priest, in that metre he enters then. For if someone speaks ill of somebody who is using the one or the

other metre as a priest, he becomes cut off[15] from that very metre. For him who knows thus there is no distress at all. He who speaks evil of him gets into distress.

Ūrja Jānāyana asked Kapivana Bhauvāyana: "If the Morning Pressing belongs to the Gāyatrī, the Midday Pressing to the Triṣṭubh and the Third Pressing to the Jagatī, what then is this Anuṣṭubh[16] which without becoming weak flies near to the beginnings of the Pressings and leads the sacrifice from beginning to end[17]?" He said: "The Anuṣṭubh is speech and by speech the sacrifice is set up. Just as in ordinary life they run back again and again with an ox[18] tied with a rope in order to draw out[19] something refractory or heavy[20], even so they yoke this speech, the Anuṣṭubh, to the heads of the Pressings for a circuitous route[21]. The heads of the Pressings are refractory as it were[22]. This speech[23] leads the sacrifice from beginning to end without becoming weak."

For him who knows the Anuṣṭubh to be reaching everywhere[24], there is also everywhere a share in that which is propitious[25]. The Gāyatrī has eight syllables, the Triṣṭubh eleven, the Jagatī twelve. The finale of the Yajñāyajñīya is *vāc*. That is the Anuṣṭubh consisting of thirty-two syllables[26]. There is also (*api*)[27] something of it in the Morning Pressing, there is also (*api*) something of it in the Midday Pressing, there is also something of it in the Third Pressing, there is also something of it in the Brahmin class, there is also something of it in the Kṣatriya class, there is also something of it in the Vaiśya class, there is also something of it in this world, there is also something of it in the intermediate space, there is also something of it in yonder world. For him who thus knows this Anuṣṭubh to be reaching everywhere (*sarvatrāpīna*), there is also everywhere a share in that which is propitious[25].

285. Keśin Dārbhya[28] drove Ahīnas Aśvatthi out of the function of Purohita in exchange for Keśin Sātyakāmi. Of these two Ahīnas was the elder, Keśin the younger. He (Ahīnas) spoke: "Hey Keśin, knowing what did you snatch the king away from me?" He said: "Well[29], I regard the Anuṣṭubh as all metres, the Bṛhatī as cattle[30], as the sacrifice and as heaven[31]". Then he (Ahīnas) was overcome by distress[32] and he lamented. Then he (Keśin) said to him: "Do not lament. If you lament, since you desire to have a Kṣatriya, then this Kṣatriya is yours. We shall look for another Kṣatriya". He (Ahīnas) said to him: "This is not out of desire for a Kṣatriya. I was overcome by distress, when I remembered my own studentship. For I did study the sacred scriptures. And it was forsooth near old age[33] that we heard this which this man who is only such a boy reports us. Thus reflecting over this I was overcome by distress".

As to his saying that the Anuṣṭubh is all metres: the Gāyatrī has eight syllables, the Triṣṭubh eleven, the Jagatī twelve. The finale of the

Yajñāyajñīya is *vāc*. That is the Anuṣṭubh consisting of thirty-two syllables[34]. Thus he said that the Anuṣṭubh were all metres.

As to his saying that the Bṛhatī is cattle: the Bṛhatī is equal to the Anuṣṭubh. When the cattle was added to it[35] the Bṛhatī was produced. As to his saying that the Bṛhatī is heaven: the Bṛhatī is heaven, as is well-known[36].

Saṃgamana Kṣaimi sent out by his teacher Āruṇi asked Satyayajña Pauluṣi: "Satyayajña, since the Gāyatrī is praised, since they praise the Triṣṭubh and the Jagatī is not praised, (one may ask) why do all of them combine to undertake the Midday Pressing?" He did not answer. He sent him away with this. If at least he would have answered: "Because the Brahmin and the Vaiśya approach the Kṣatriya respectfully, and since they are subjected to him[37] and because this is a verse-quarter of twelve syllables[38]" (this would have been alright)[39].

286. When the metres divided these worlds, the Gāyatrī obtained this world, the Triṣṭubh the intermediate space and the Jagatī yonder world. The Gāyatrī is the Brahmin class, the Triṣṭubh the Kṣatriya class, the Jagatī the Vaiśya class. The Triṣṭubh did not enough rejoice this outcome[40] in the intermediate space. She tried to wound the Gāyatrī in front and caused distress to her. She (the Gāyatrī) was afraid of her (i.e. of the Triṣṭubh) thinking: "She will take away my own place", and she said to her: "Salutation to you. Wishing what do you try to wound me?" "Give me a present" she (i.e. the Triṣṭubh) said. She (the Gāyatrī) gave two eight syllabic Pādas. Then she (the Triṣṭubh) turned to the Jagatī. She tried to wound her and caused distress to her. She (i.e. the Jagatī) feared: "She will take away my own place". She spoke to her (the Triṣṭubh): "Salutation to you. Wishing what do you try to wound me?" She said: "Give me a present". She (i.e. the Jagatī) gave a Pāda consisting of twelve syllables to her. Then she again turned to the Gāyatrī. She spoke to her (i.e. to the Triṣṭubh):

"Since I gave you a present, (I may ask you now) what do you look for?" "Give me your whole self". "What will remain of me?" "We will share our food and I will give you a prominent position". "All right". She gave a prominent position to her. Since now the Gāyatrī had given her whole self, therefore the Brahmin[41] goes with his whole self to the Kṣatriya[41] and because the Jagatī did not give its whole self, the Vaiśya class uses to retire as it were from the Kṣatriyas. Whatever the Gāyatrī and the Jagatī gave (to the Triṣṭubh), that became the Bṛhatī. Therefore the Bṛhatī contains three eight-syllabic and one twelve-syllabic verse-quarter. The Gāyatrī is used first: *uccā te jātam andhasam*[42]. This (verse) represents two meanings to be ascertained for the term *purohita*[43]. He who knows thus obtains a prominent position or nothing but the position of a Purohita[44].

287. Then the Bṛhatī (is used), then the Triṣṭubh. Thus food is surrounded[45] on both sides, (namely) by the Brahmins (the Gāyatrī) and by the Kṣatriyas (the Triṣṭubh). The food surrounded on both sides by the Brahmins and the Kṣatriyas is at the service of him who knows thus. Therefore the Brahmin should not be hostile to the Kṣatriya and the Kṣatriya should not be hostile to the Brahmin, for their food is collective property. Therefore, when a Brahmin becomes an important rich man[46], he chooses a Kṣatriya as the second protector of his food[47] and when a Kṣatriya (becomes an important, rich man, he chooses) the Brahmin. He who knows thus finds a Kṣatriya as his protector.

In the beginning the metres (Gāyatrī, Triṣṭubh and Jagatī) had four syllables (in each Pāda) and they were not able to draw the sacrifice. Now Soma was in the third heaven, the heaven of Indra. The people who guarded it were the fires and the Gandharvas, they were the Dhiṣṇyas and they were also (said to be) poisonous snakes. It was lying in two golden chargers[48]. These two used to be snapped together in a flash (as soon as one tried to take away something).

Then these metres said: "Let us fetch the Soma and perform the sacrifice". First the Jagatī flew up, thinking herself to be the most powerful, the strongest, the most important, the most forceful. When she had arrived, the guardians of the Soma robbed three of her syllables. Having only one syllable she returned bringing the initiation (for the sacrifice) and cattle[49]. Therefore, the initiation has a predilection for him who has much cattle.

Then the Triṣṭubh flew up. When she had arrived, the guardians of the Soma robbed one of her syllables. Having three syllables she returned bringing asceticism and the Dakṣiṇās. Therefore Dakṣiṇās (i.e. the Dakṣiṇā-cows) are fetched within the room available for the Triṣṭubh[50]. Therefore also they consider him to be practising asceticism—

288. —who gives (Dakṣiṇās)[51].

Then the Gāyatrī flew up. Her mother[52], Anuṣṭubh, followed her with looks. Therefore a mother should follow her son with her looks, when he goes abroad (saying:) "Return alive and bringing something". She took two Pressings with her claws[53], one in each claw, and the syllables of the other two (that had been robbed), and with her beak one Savana. She came back with the whole sacrifice. Therefore they said here: "The Third Pressing is sucked out as it were[54], for she brought it in her beak". Having brought the Soma she said to the other two metres: "It is me who has brought the Soma and I will perform the sacrifice". They said: "We two are mutilated[55], we are not able to do so". The Gāyatrī, however, undertaking the Morning Pressing said: "I shall draw it". She drew it, and she brought it to a close. Therefore the Morning Pressing is called sacred to the Gāyatrī.

Then she undertook the Midday Pressing. She had accomplished one strophe consisting of three verses[56], but then the Triṣṭubh felt slighted, and said: "I come too". "You do of course"[57] she (Gāyatrī) said, "I will draw (the Pressing) for you, but under your name". She came with the three syllables (which she had caught back) to her. Having become a Triṣṭubh of eleven syllables (i.e. 8 + 3) she drew the Midday Pressing. She brought it to a close. Because she said to the Triṣṭubh: "I will draw (the Pressing) for you, but under your name", therefore the Midday Pressing is called sacred to the Triṣṭubh.

Then she undertook the Third Pressing. She had accomplished one strophe consisting of three verses, but then the Jagatī felt slighted. She said: "I come too". "Of course you do"[57] she said, "I will draw (the Pressing) for you, but under your name". She came to her with the one syllable (which she had caught back). Having become twelve-syllabic (8 + 3 + 1) she drew the Third Pressing. She brought it to a close. Because she said to the Jagatī: "I will draw (the Third Pressing) for you, but under your name", therefore the Third Pressing is called sacred to the Jagatī.

289. The Gāyatrī draws the Morning Pressing, the Gāyatrī the Midday Pressing, the Gāyatrī the Third Pressing. He who thus knows this, from him glory and fame do not go away till his old age[58]. As to this Āruṇi used to say: "I know that the Gāyatrī draws all the pressings[59]. Therefore till old age glory and fame do not go away from me". From him who knows thus glory and fame do not go away till old age[58].

These metres said: "She is the best and the most forceful among us who has fetched the Soma and has organised[60] the sacrifice. Let us strengthen her. The Triṣṭubh and the Jagatī strengthened her[61] with (the corresponding) two Pressings. And they strengthened her with the two eightsyllabic Pādas of the Uṣṇih and the Kakubh. And she became also strengthened by the three eightsyllabic Pādas of the Bṛhatī. And she also became strengthened by the four eightsyllabic Pādas of the Anuṣṭubh. And she also became strengthened by the five eightsyllabic Pādas of the Paṅkti.

290. She had ten syllables in the beginning. Eager to [62] she too made her Pādas consisting of eight syllables. If one finds a Pāda consisting of eight syllables in the Atichandas, in the Virāj or in whatever metre, this means then that all the metres join the Gāyatrī. If someone thus knows this: "All the metres join the Gāyatrī", his own men acknowledge his superiority. As to this they say: "The (other) Stomas surpass the Trivṛt, but the (other) metres do not surpass the Gāyatrī". One should say: "Not at all do the (other) Stomas surpass the Trivṛt, neither do the (other) metres surpass the Gāyatrī". For (all) the

Stomas have three beginnings, three middles and three conclusions. For this reason also all the metres do not surpass the Gāyatrī[63].

Now Aupāvi once asked Āruṇi: "O Āruṇi, Āruṇi, which sacrifice does the Anuṣṭubh offer to whom?" (= "the Anuṣṭubh offers the sacrifice to the benefit of Ka") He did not know an answer to this. He (Aupāvi) said: "I have overpowered, I have overpowered[64]. Gautama[65] did not realize that forsooth he was taught a lesson by me (and not asked a question) (when I stated rather than asked): "I teach you Ka[66], (. . . .)[67]. "If he had answered, he should have answered: "The Anuṣṭubh is Prajāpati[68], Ka is Prajāpati. She (the Anuṣṭubh = Prajāpati) offers Ka (= Prajāpati) to Prajāpati (= Ka)". But this was probably[69] not correct. Since all the metres agree with the Bṛhatī[70]—and the Bṛhatī is heaven—[71] he should have answered: "She offers Ka to heaven".

V. 9. *The Bṛhat and the Rathantara* (291–298)

Auswahl, 117–123; Ghosh; *Fragments*, 21–24
JB. 2, 433: 1, 128–137

291. They contemplate: "Should there be sacrificed with a Bṛhat Sāman or with a Rathantara Sāman"? "With a Rathantara Sāman", the Sāvayasas say. "The Rathantara is this world. This we know. Who would undertake the unknown rather than[1] the known? Just as for (people in) a deep pit that has been dug, (the world) beyond looks like darkness, even so is yonder world presumably[2] beyond space. Who knows whether it exists there or not[3]. Moreover (if yonder world exists at all), it is anyhow[2] dependent[4] on this world. For yonder world lives on what is given from here[5]. For it is on the oblations that go from here that yonder world lives. Even if one would sacrifice ten times, one should sacrifice with the Rathantara Sāman."

Āruṇi and the descendants of Satyayajña say: "One should apply the Bṛhat Sāman (in the first Pṛṣṭha Stotra). The Bṛhat is yonder world. That which is yonder, is something elevated, of which the evil has been repelled and which bestows future welfare. People do not spit on it, do not walk on it, do not sit on it. Many people speak ill of this world; many people are inclined to despise[6] it. Both saint and sinner live in this world. But yonder world is something elevated, of which the evil has been repelled and which bestows future welfare. No sinner lives there. Moreover this world anyhow is dependent on yonder world. For this world lives upon it. Even if one would sacrifice ten times, one should sacrifice with the Bṛhat Sāman."

"There should be sacrificed with both Sāmans"[7] Śāṭyāyani used to say "in order to obtain the aims connected with both of them. Thus[8] one

obtains both aims". This Sāman thus completely yoked by him draws the sacrifice[9].

292. [10]Its Hiṃkāra is the Gāyatra Sāman, its introduction (*prastāva*) the Rathantara, its Udgītha the Vāmadevya Sāman, its Pratihāra the Bṛhat Sāman and its finale (*nidhana*) the Yajñāyajñīya. Each of them, one by one, is master of heaven. He who knows thus reaches heaven.

Moreover it is related to the fire-altar[11], it is the Mahāvrata (Sāman)[12]. Its head is the Gāyatra Sāman, its wings the Bṛhat and the Rathantara, its body the Vāmadevya, its tail the Yajñāyajñīya. As much as one reaches with a sacrifice which contains an Agnicayana and a Mahāvrata, so much he reaches who knows thus.

Moreover it has an arrangement by which one may obtain a long life. The Gāyatra is life (*āyus*)[13], the Rathantara is all life (*viśvāyus*), the Vāmadevya is complete life (*samāyus*)[14]. The Bṛhat is full life (*sarvāyus*) and the Yajñāyajñīya extremely long life (*atyāyus*)[15].

Moreover they have these well-known five "lights" which shine in these worlds[16]: fire on earth, wind in space, the sun in heaven, the moon among the stars and lightning in the waters[17], i.e. the fire (kindled) by the Rathantara, the wind by the Vāmadevya, the sun by the Bṛhat, the moon by the Gāyatra and lightning by the Yajñāyajñīya. For the Yajñāyajñīya is the waters[18]. He who knows thus has these five "lights" which shine in these worlds[16].

293. He who knows the limited and the unlimited of Bṛhat and Rathantara takes hold of the limit of prosperity on all sides and wins the unlimited world of heaven. The Rathantara is this world. Of this world the ocean is the limit. The Bṛhat is yonder world. Of yonder world there is no limit. Thus it is visible even beyond the ocean. He who thus knows the limited and the unlimited of Bṛhat and Rathantara, takes hold of the limit of prosperity on all sides and wins the unlimited world of heaven.

He who knows the Stoma verse (*stomya*) and the Stotra verse of Bṛhat and Rathantara, becomes laudable (*stomya*) and his own people praise him (saying): "This man is the best among us". The verse: "We cry at you, o hero, as cows unmilked, at you who rule this animated world, at the ruler of the inanimate world, who sees the sun"[19] is the Stoma verse. The verse: "No one else among the celestials and the terrestrials was born or will be born equal to you" is the Stotra verse.

With this verse: "Longing for horses, longing for cows we, in competition, call upon you, o bounteous one"[20] what is asked is proclaimed as valour. He who thus knows these two verses, the Stoma verse and the Stotra verse of Bṛhat and Rathantara, becomes laudable and his own people praise him (saying): "This is the best among us". Moreover by knowing this all the strophes of three verses are known by him.

294. The Bṛhat and the Rathantara were created. After they had been

created the cattle was created: the Rathantara animals after the Rathantara, the Bṛhat animals after the Bṛhat. They were hit by strife. Then there continued to be a disunion[21]. They both said: "If we shall be like this, then we shall not be able to support the creatures[22]. Well, let us exchange our forms." They exchanged their forms. The voice of the Rathantara entered the Bṛhat animals, the voice of the Bṛhat the Rathantara animals[23]. The cow is a Rathantara animal, since with her face she is directed downwards as it were[24]. She speaks a Bṛhat sound which is turned away: *bhā*[25]. The sheep makes a Rathantara sound, when she bleats[26]. The goat is a Bṛhat animal, since she is mounting upwards as it were[27]. She makes a Rathantara sound,—

295. —when she bleats[28].

They did not reach agreement on man. They said: "Let us both enter him". "All right". They both entered him. Therefore man produces both the Bṛhat as well as the Rathantara sound, when he speaks. The Rathantara animals observing his Rathantara voice serve him and so do the Bṛhat animals observing his Bṛhat voice. Man is the crying out together (= harmony) of the Bṛhat and the Rathantara. With him who knows: "Man is the crying out together (= harmony) of the Bṛhat and the Rathantara" both the Rathantara as well as the Bṛhat animals cry out together (= live in harmony). For the man who (actually) is this crying together of the Bṛhat and the Rathantara (i.e. who actually combines both aspects in his voice) and knows thus or for someone who (only) knows thus, there is a harmony of both these groups of animals[29].

296. When Āruṇi was travelling (in their country)[30] the Northerners from all sides rushed on[31] to him (saying): "Āruṇi, Āruṇi, by how much do the Bṛhat and the Rathantara create the creatures? By how much do they attain the glory of the gods?" He did not answer their question (but said): "I know this, namely that you want to obtain my esoteric knowledge. Therefore I shall not answer you". His pupils who lived in his house, held the following view about him: "He has answered thus out of lack of knowledge. He did not know it at all. Well, let us ask him". They said to him: "If you had answered, how would you have answered"? He said: "In that he (the Prastotṛ) uses eight syllables of the first[32] verse for his Prastāva, thereby they both create the animals with eight hoofs. In that he uses two syllables of the other two, thereby they both create the bipeds[33]. By means of the finale[34] they both attain the glory of the gods".

He who knows the invocation of the gods produced by Bṛhat and Rathantara, up to his invocation the gods come. The invocation of the gods produced by the Rathantara is upwards, that of the Bṛhat downwards. Because he (the Prastotṛ) performs the Prastāva with the verse of the Rathantara without inserting repeated exclamations (Stobhas) and

consequently upwards, therefore this world is upwards, this fire flames upwards, the plants and trees (grow) upwards, everything is upwards. And because he performs the Prastāva with the verse of the Bṛhat inserting the repeated exclamations[35] *au ho* and consequently downwards, therefore yonder world is downwards, the sun shines downwards, the moon shines downwards, the stars shines downwards, the rain comes downwards, everything is downwards. He who thus knows the invocations of the gods produced by Bṛhat and Rathantara, up to his invocations the gods come.

297. The Bṛhat and the Rathantara were created. After they had been created the animals were created: the Rathantara animals after the Rathantara, the Bṛhat animals after the Bṛhat. The Rathantara animals are to be eaten, the Bṛhat animals are eaters[36]. Because he performs the Prastāva with the verse of the Rathantara without inserting repeated exclamations, therefore the Rathantara animals walk on bones (i.e. hoofs)[37] and are edible. And because he performs the Prastāva with the verse of the Bṛhat inserting repeated exclamations, therefore the Bṛhat animals walk on flesh (i.e. hoofless)[37] and are beasts of prey. He who knows thus gets much food as an eater of food and a son is born to him who is a hero and an eater of food.

The Bṛhat and the Rathantara place the foetus in the creatures in the middle (of the Agniṣṭoma). At the end (of the Agniṣṭoma) they produce these (foetus) from there with the Yajñāyajñīya. When one performs the Prastāva with eight syllables of the first verse, they place the foetus of the eight-hoofed animals, when one does so with two syllables of the next two verses, thereby they place the foetus of the bipeds. When the Yajñāyajñīya is performed at the end by someone who knows thus, then that means the birth. Thereby he brings forth. Therefore one should grant a wish on the occasion of the Yajñāyajñīya Stotra[38], just as one grants a wish when a son is born[39]. For this is the birth of the Yajamāna.

And the water which the wife (of Yajamāna) pours out (on the occasion of this Stotra)[40] is the same as the water which appears then (at birth) when the amnion[41] breaks. Moreover water is food. It is the (liquid) food which is put to the lips of the just born. It has also the word *vāc* (speech or voice) as its finale. Therefore, as soon as he is born a baby makes sound.

298. The Bṛhat and the Rathantara were created. They were created with the same finale, which was either inside or outside the verse. They said: "Let us run a race with these two finales as its stake". "All right". They ran a race[42]. Then the Bṛhat won. Then the Rathantara felt inferior. Therefore he said: "These two (finales) are two parts of a pair[43]. Give me an application which takes into account the regular

order[44]". "All right". He got his pairing. And he (Bṛhat) gave to him the application as first (of the two), namely the forenoon. The application of the Rathantara is the forenoon, of the Bṛhat the afternoon. (The finale) of the Rathantara is *as*, of the Bṛhat *has*.

These two have finales which together form the word *aha* (or *ahar*) and (therefore) are true finales[45]. The finale of these two together is truth. Therefore the Yajamāna should sacrifice with both Sāmans till night (the end of *ahar*). The Bṛhat and the Rathantara, they are both obtained. *sa tam iti*[46]. By him both the Bṛhat and the Rathantara are obtained.

[47]Now they say: "Do the Bṛhat and the Rathantara have a finale inside or outside the verse?". He should say: "Both inside and outside the verse". This world is the Rathantara, yonder world the Bṛhat. The finale of both of them is the space. Thereby they both have a finale inside the verse. And because they think that there is space beyond heaven and likewise that there is water beyond (i.e. below) the earth, therefore these two have finales outside the verse[47].

Now they say: "Is the Vāmadevyam situated inside the Bṛhat and the Rathantara, or are Bṛhat and Rathantara situated inside the Vāmadevya?" He should say: "Both. The Vāmadevya is situated inside Bṛhat and Rathantara and Bṛhat and Rathantara inside the Vāmadevya". This world is the Rathantara, yonder world the Bṛhat. This space is the Vāmadevya. Therefore the Vāmadevya is inside Bṛhat and Rathantara. And because they think that there is space beyond heaven and likewise water beyond the earth, therefore also Bṛhat and Rathantara are inside the Vāmadevya[48].

V. 10. *The symbolism of the end of a Sāman: a survey of the Sāmans of the Agniṣṭoma* (299–311)

299. When Prajāpati had created the creatures from his "womb", then he wavered[1]. He remained blazing and beaming. Then he realised: "There is (still) something inside (me)". He spoke to the gods: "There is this here inside (me). You should emit it from here". Agni emitted the Sāmans with a tone on the last vowel by means of the Gāyatrī; Indra the Sāmans ending with a finale by means of the Triṣṭubh; the All-gods the Sāmans ending with *iḷā*[2] by means of the Jagatī; Prajāpati the Sāmans whose ending is identical with that of the Ṛc[3] by means of the Anuṣṭubh[4]. That which is connected with the Gāyatrī and has a tone on the last vowel, that is sacred to Agni as far as the deity is concerned. That which is connected with the Triṣṭubh and has a finale, that is sacred to Indra as far as the deity is concerned. That which is connected with

the Jagatī and has *iḷā* as its finale, that is sacred to the All-gods as far as the deity is concerned. That which is connected with the Anuṣṭubh and of which the end is identical with the Ṛc, that is sacred to Prajāpati as far as the deity is concerned.

As to this also Iyapi Saumāpa used to say: "The Bṛhat and the Rathantara do not form the arrangement of the sacrifice. Both of them have their finale either inside or outside the verse. Those (Sāmans) that have a tone on the final vowel or have an ending that is identical with that of the Ṛc, those forsooth form the arrangement of the sacrifice". In that the end comes with (the end of) the Ṛc, thereby it is Rathantara-like, in that it has a tone which is sustained further than the (last syllable of the) Ṛc, thereby it is Bṛhat-like.

300. As to this they say: "How many Sāmans are there?". One should say: "Four". There are four Sāmans, the one with a tone on the last vowel, the one ending with a finale, the one ending with *iḷā* and the one which has an end that is identical with the Ṛc. There are four quarters of space and cattle has four feet. There are four metres that conduct the sacrifice, the Gāyatrī, the Triṣṭubh, the Jagatī and the Anuṣṭubh.

They are also (to be counted as) three, namely with a tone on the last vowel, with a finale, and ending with *iḷā*: "with a tone on the last vowel" (*svāra*) and "having an end which is identical with that of the Ṛc" (*ṛksama*) is the same. The sacrifice has three pressings, there are three breaths, exhalation, inhalation and circulation.

They are also (to be counted as) two, namely having a tone on the last vowel and having a finale: *iḷā* and finale are the same. There are two worlds here which are the most visible[5], there are two breaths, exhalation and inhalation, man has two legs.

It is also (to be counted as) one, namely with a tone on the last vowel. The tone on the last syllable is the same as a finale, as the *iḷā* and as the ending which is identical with the Ṛc. It is he who blows there. Yonder beings (birds) that fly above (him) and the beings here that creep below (him) live upon this vital breath which is the special tone (*svara*)[6]. He who thus knows this reaches a complete lifetime.

He who knowing thus produces sameness[7], by him thereby variation is produced. One should however wish to produce this variation continuously[8]. Sameness does not lead to pairing and offspring, just as when two men or two women would lie together[9]. Neither the two men would bring forth any child nor the two women, if they did not get a (third) copulating partner (of the other sex). On the other hand, that which is variation means copulation and generation[10].

The tone is the self, the finale is the offspring, *iḷā* is cattle[11], the end of a Sāman which is identical with the Ṛc is the wife[12]. The self and the wife are the same. Thus[13] the offspring is enclosed on both sides by

oneself, in order that it may not be laid aside as something worthless. The wealth of him who knows thus does not become scattered.

301. One should not cause these (several forms of) finales to come into collision. One should not make two *svāra* endings together. The tone (*svara*) is breath[14]. One would then cause the one breath to come into collision with the other. The sacrificer would perish.

If one were to make two finales together—the finale is a Vajra—one would then cause a Vajra to come into collision with a Vajra. A great conflict would then be imminent in that country. Punishment would hit the Udgātṛ, an arrow the sacrificer.

If one were to make two *iḷā*-endings together—*iḷā* is cattle—one would then cause cattle to come into collision with cattle. The great God (= Rudra) would appease (= kill) the cattle of that country. The Udgātṛ would suffer the complete loss of all his property and the sacrificer would incur absence of livelihood.

If one were to make two endings which are identical with the Ṛc-ending, together, the wife (of the sacrificer)[15] then would perish, or an inferior form of death would kill the sacrificer. Destruction[16] of the ego (suicide) is an inferior form of death, and—

302. —(death caused by) a tiger, by a thief. Therefore one should not cause these endings to come into collision (thinking); "Lest I suffer[17]".

These four (kinds of) Sāmans (or Sāmanendings) have also a fourfold sacred background[18]. Now they also say with regard to this: "Who is master of his cautiousness? And it also definitely happens that one is indeed careless". (Therefore an alternative explanation of the double use of a particular ending has to be found).

If one were to make two *svāra* endings together—the tone (*svara*) is breath—in that case one should think: "I have hereby made more lifebreath for the lifebreath, I shall live long".

If one were to make two finales[19] together—that (i.e. the finale) is offspring—in that case one should think: "I have hereby established offspring in offspring. I shall become rich in offspring thereby". Moreover (one should think): "The finale is a Vajra. Hereby I have thrown a Vajra at my hating rival".

If one were to make two *iḷā*-endings together—*iḷā* is cattle—in that case one should think: "I have hereby added more cattle to my cattle. I shall become rich in cattle".

If[20] one were to make two endings which are identical with the Ṛc-ending, together,—the ending which is identical with the Ṛc-ending, is procreation[21]—in that case one should think: "I have hereby added more (possibilities of) procreation to my procession. I shall bring home a new wife (in addition) to my wife. I shall multiply, I shall get offspring".

Thus it does not overcome him. He who would criticize him because he is doing so, to him he should say: "My knowledge about this is correct and not wrong. If there is something wrong about this which you know, then it will happen to you. And if you have also acted as a priest before with a Sāman, then you have also made a sameness (= lack of variation)." He who criticizes someone who knows thus, will meet with distress.

303. Now one should not miss these three forms of the Midday Pressing, the one that contains the word plant (*andhas*)[22], the one that contains the word Marut[23] and the one that contains the word *pratna*[24]. The plant means food, the Maruts are strength, the word *pratna* ("old") is heaven. If he should miss that which contains the word *andhas*, he would miss food. If he should miss that which contains the word *marut*, he would miss strength. If he should miss that which contains the word *pratna*, he would miss heaven. If he should not have room for all of them, then at least he should not miss that which contains the word *marut*. That which contains the word *marut* is strength. With strength all work is done, with strength one reaches everything. Therefore one should not miss that which contains the word *marut*.

One ascends this Gāyatrī with a tone (*svara*)[25]. The tone is breath. Thereby one ascends the breath with the breath. The breath does not injure the breath. In that one ascends the Gāyatrī with a tone thereby one puts breath right at the beginning of the sacrifice. Therefore this breath was placed (or: created) right at the beginning.

The Sāman with a tone on the last vowel (*svāra*) is sacred to Agni as far as the deity is concerned. The Gāyatrī is the metre that is sacred to Agni. Thereby he ascends Agni with Agni. Agni is the one who prepares a way among the gods. Along whatever track Agni goes, he goes making a path. When one ascends the Gāyatrī with a tone, one thereby yokes Agni, who prepares the way, right at the beginning of the sacrifice. One follows a path made by Agni. Just as going along a path, thus he reaches safely and unharmed the end who knowing thus ascends the Gāyatrī with a tone.

304. One ascends with a second (version of this Gāyatrī), now with a finale[26]. The finale is Indra[27]. Indra is the leader of the gods. Where a leader takes charge of the front of a (travelling) clan[28], there forsooth is no (chance of) harm. He who knowing thus ascends with a second (version of this Gāyatrī verse in the following Sāman) with a finale, unharmed and safely reaches the end.

Moreover Indra and Agni are the swiftest among the gods[29]. This is like yoking the two swiftest (horses) and the two that draw best.

Then one ascends this Bṛhatī with *iḷā* as ending[30]. The *iḷā* means cattle

and the Bṛhatī is cattle[31]. Thereby one unites cattle with cattle. Cattle united with cattle looks more splendid.

If one were to ascend with a finale—the finale is a Vajra—then one would let a Vajra go around the cattle. If one should not find room for an *iḷā* (ending), then one should ascend with a tone (*svara*) (on the last vowel). The tone is breath. The Bṛhatī is cattle. Thereby one places breath in the cattle.

The second (Sāman chanted on this Bṛhatī) has three finales[32]. There are three worlds here. The finales are Vajras[33]. By means of these Vajras one repels all evil from these worlds. Moreover these keep warding of all evil for him in these worlds. There are also three rents in the sacrifice[34]. Then two (finales) form a cover. One (finale) becomes a stronghold[35].

305. Then one ascends this Triṣṭubh with a tone[36]. The tone is breath. The (Midday) Pavamāna is man-like. It has a Sāman with a tone on the last vowel in front (i.e. in the beginning, in the first Sāman, the Gāyatra) and one behind (i.e. at the end, in the last Sāman, the Auśana). These are these two airs which are moved in opposite directions. By means of these two one makes sound in both directions (i.e. forward, with the *prāṇa*, out of the mouth, and backwards, with the *apāna*, out of the anus)[37].

Then the Rathantara. That is the emission of seed[38].

Then the Vāmadevya, which has a tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath. Thereby one places breath (i.e. life) in the seed which was emitted[39].

Then (as third Pṛṣṭha Stotra) the Naudhasa, which has no finale[40]. That means birth. Thereby one brings forth.

Then (as fourth Pṛṣṭha laud) the Kāleya, which has *iḷā* as its ending. The *iḷā* is cattle. Cattle is food. This is the (liquid) food which is put to the lips of the just born.

Then (in the Third Pressing) the Gāyatrī verse of the Ārbhavapavamāna on which the Brāhmaṇa has been taught already[41].

Then one ascends this Kakubh with a tone on the last vowel (of the Sabha Sāman)[42]. The tone is breath, the Kakubh is mutilated[43]. Thereby one makes the breath mutilated. If one were to ascend with a finale—the finale is a Vajra—that would be like striking an ill man with a stick. But if one ascends with a tone, one thereby places breath in her (i.e. in the Kakubh). One thereby heals her.

Then one ascends this Uṣṇih (on which the Pauṣkala Sāman is chanted) with a finale. The finale is a Vajra, the Uṣṇih is cattle[44]. The cattle then becomes decrepit as it were in the Third Pressing. Therefore one says about an old cow: "Try to make money out of her"[45]. And

also, having rushed (at the Uṣṇih cattle) with a Vajra, they divide the (Uṣṇih-cow) into portions with a butcher's knife (i.e. the Vajra-finale) and eats it[46].

And when they reject the Bṛhatī with a finale[47], then the cows become young as it were, not decrepit so to say. Therefore they call a young cow something as desirable as one's (own) life[48].

306. Then one ascends this Anuṣṭubh with a special tone on the last vowel (of the Śyāvāśva chant). The tone is breath, the Anuṣṭubh speech. Speech and breath are a divine couple. Thereby one makes the couple (or: pairing, copulation) divine. If one were to ascend with a finale—the finale is a Vajra—then the divine couple would become separated by a Vajra. If one should not find room for a tone, then one should ascend with a finale in the form of the word *vāc*[49]. The Anuṣṭubh is speech (*vāc*), the finale is the word *vāc*. Speech does not harm speech.

Then there is a second (Sāman based on this Anuṣṭubh, namely Āndhīgava) which has a finale in the middle. The Anuṣṭubh is speech. Thus there is a finale in the middle of the Anuṣṭubh, of speech. That is the emission of seed. That is accompanied with the sound Hiṃ[50]. The Hiṃ-sound is a navel. Embryos held by the navel do not descend from the downward openings. For they are supported by the navel.

Of that tensyllabic verse there is a finale in the middle. The Virāj is tensyllabic. The Virāj is food. On this embryos live without eating food.

Then one ascends this Jagatī with a special tone (on the last vowel of the Kāva Sāman). The tone is breath. The (Ārbhava) Pavamāna is man-like. There is a Sāman with a tone on the last vowel in front (i.e. at the beginning of the Ārbhava Pavamāna, in the Gāyatra) and one behind (i.e. at the end of the Pavamāna, in the Kāva Sāman). These are these two airs which are moved in opposite directions. By means of these two one makes sound in both directions (i.e. forward, with the *prāṇa*, out of the mouth, and backwards, with the *apāna*, out of the anus)[51].

Then the Yajñāyajñīya. That is the emission of seed[52].

Then the Sākamaśva (the first Uktha laud of the Ukthya) with a tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath. Thereby one places breath (= life) in the emitted seed.

Then the Saubhara (Sāman) which has no finale[53]. That is birth. Thereby ones brings forth.

Then the (third and last Uktha laud the) Nārmedha which has *iḷā* as its ending. The *iḷā* is cattle. Cattle is food. This is the (liquid) food which is put to the lips of the just born.

Thus goes the first round (of the Atirātra), thus the second, thus the third[54].

307. There are three endings: the *iḷā*, the tone and the proper finale. The ending which is identical with that of the Ṛc, they consider to be

identical with the tone (on the last vowel). The sameness and variation of the Sāman which has the same endings as the Ṛc and of the Sāman with a tone on the final vowel is the same.

The *iḷā* is this world[55]. The *iḷā* is cattle. This world is cattle. The tone is this world. The tone is breath. The air (*antarikṣa*) is breath. The finale is yonder world; it is the goal and the support. Whoever arranges them with variation[56] and in a systematic way, should first apply the Sāman with *iḷā* as its ending. Then the Sāman with a tone on the last vowel, then the Sāman with a proper finale. For in this way these worlds are arranged in a systematic order. The finale forsooth is the self. The tone is breath. The *iḷā* is cattle. Because now a Sāman with a tone is applied between a Sāman ending with the *iḷā* and one with a finale, everything here becomes connected with life for him. For this lifebreath (*prāṇa*) abides between the creatures, the cattle and the worlds in the middle.

When the Bṛhat and the Rathantara divided the Sāmans—

308. —some became Rathantara-like, some Bṛhat-like. Those about which they reached agreement, became Rathantara-Bṛhat-like and Bṛhat-Rathantara-like.

What has a Prastāva which only consists of the Ṛc[57], and has an internal finale, is Rathantara-like. What is preceded by a Stobha[58] (in its Prastāva) and has an external finale, is Bṛhat-like. And that which has a Prastāva which only consists of the Ṛc, and has an external finale, is Rathantara-Bṛhat-like. That which is preceded by a Stobha (in its Prastāva) and has an internal finale, is Bṛhat-Rathantara-like.

As to this they say: "How many Sāmans are there?".

One should say: "Four". The four Sāmans are the Rathantara-like, the Bṛhat-like, the Rathantara-Bṛhat-like, the Bṛhat-Rathantara-like. Whoever arranges them with a variation and systematically should first apply the Rathantara-like, then the Bṛhat-like, then the Rathantara-Bṛhat-like, then the Bṛhat-Rathantara-like. Of these four kinds of Sāmans one also produces six forms by intertwining. Whoever arranges with variation as far as the form is concerned[59], arranges everything[60] with variation as far as the finales are concerned[61].

309. This is a correct arrangement. One should undertake the Gāyatrī[62] with a Sāman which has a finale. The finale is strength, the Gāyatrī is strength. Thereby one causes strength to be furnished[63] with cattle.

One should undertake the Bṛhatī with a Sāman ending with *iḷā*. The *iḷā* is cattle, the Bṛhatī is cattle. Thereby one causes cattle to be furnished with cattle.

The last (Sāman of the midday laud, i.e. the Auśana) should have a tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath, the end (the last Sāman) is breath (i.e. expiration). He who knows thus reaches a complete lifetime (before he breathes his last).

The (first) Pṛṣṭha is made a Rathantara or a Bṛhat with a finale. The finale is strength, the Pṛṣṭha is strength[64]. Thereby one causes strength to be furnished with strength.

The Maitrāvaruṇasāman (i.e. the Vāmadevya) has a tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath, the Maitrāvaruṇasāman is breath.

The Brahmasāman (i.e. the Naudhasa) has a finale consisting of the two syllables. A pair (of feet) is a support. The Brahmasāman is a support.

The Acchāvākasāman (i.e. the Kāleya) has the *iḷā* as its ending. The *iḷā* is cattle, the Acchāvākasāman is cattle[65].

One should undertake the Gāyatrī of the Ārbhava Pavamāna with the Gāyatra Sāman which has an internal finale, with the Bṛhat Sāman which has an external finale.

One should undertake the Kakubh with (a Sāman, i.c. the Sapha, ending with) a tone. The tone is breath. The Kakubh is mutilated. Thereby one makes the breath mutilated.

One should undertake the Uṣṇih either with a Sāman which has the *iḷā* as its ending or with one that has a finale. The finale is strength, the Uṣṇih is strength. The *iḷā* is cattle, the Uṣṇih is cattle. One should undertake it with that one which one desires.

One should undertake the Anuṣṭubh with a Sāman which ends with the tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath, the Anuṣṭubh is speech. Thereby one joins speech with breath in one continuous movement.

The last Sāman (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna, i.c. the Kava) has a tone on the last vowel. The tone is breath, the last one (i.e. the end, death) is breath (i.e. expiration). He who knows thus reaches a complete lifetime.

310. The Yajñāyajñīya Sāman (i.e. the Agniṣṭoma laud), which comes last, has a finale in the form of the word *vāc*. Therefore one places the whole sacrifice, after it has been completely performed, in speech. For him who knows thus the results of his sacrifices and his liberality do not come to naught. Moreover there is no ruin of his speech (or: voice).

A Sāman based on a verse in which the word Marut occurs, should not be missing in the Midday laud. For thereby one becomes beautiful and powerful. One should make it of the Rathantara Sāman on Gāyatrī verses and on Triṣṭubh verses of the Bṛhat Sāman. One makes the last with three finales on a Bṛhatī verse. Whatever is deficient of the sacrifice here, that one appeases thereby.

A Sāman based on a verse in which the words *mad* and *andhas* occur, should not be missing in the Ārbhava Pavamāna. For thereby one becomes beautiful and powerful. One should make it of the Rathantara Sāman on Gāyatrī verses, of the Bṛhat Sāman on Anuṣṭubhs. One makes

the last with an internal finale and ending with *iḷā* on an Anuṣṭubh verse. Whatever is deficient of the sacrifice here, that one appeases thereby.

Because a Sāman based on a verse in which the word Marut occurs and a Sāman with three finales are not missing in the Midday laud, and a Sāman based on a verse in which the words *mad* and *andhas* occur as well as a Sāman with an internal finale and ending with *iḷā* are not missing in the Ārbhava Pavamāna, therefore all these things are not missing for him.

One should not make the Gāyatra Sāman (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna) based on a single verse. One may, reluctantly, make these two based on a single verse, namely the one which ends with *iḷā*[66] and the one which has a finale in the middle and is chanted on an Anuṣṭubh (i.e. the Āndhīgava) (as well as the Gāyatra Sāman) in the Trivṛt Stoma (i.e. in the Bahiṣpavamāna). The two Sāmans chanted on the Uṣṇih and the Kakubh (i.e. Sabha and Pauṣkala) one may make on a strophe of three verses or on a single verse. The last Sāman (of the Ārbhava Pavamāna, i.e. the Kava) does not have the choice between the strophe of three verses and the single verse. It does not have the position[67] for the purpose of using a single verse with reference to Ṛc and Sāman; neither does the Gāyatrī of the Ārbhava Pavamāna (i.e. the Saṃhita Sāman), nor the Agniṣṭoma Sāman (i.e. the Yajñāyajñīya).

311. There are three bellies of the sacrifice: the Gāyatrī, the Bṛhatī, and the Anuṣṭubh. For therein they throw (everything), therefrom they take out (everything). This is just as with man, who is either satiated or hungry. And just as there are further limbs (of the body depending on the food coming in the belly), there are further Stotras.

There are four Sāmans which do not[68] have the position for the purpose of using single verses: the Bṛhat, the Rathantara, the Vāmadevya and the Yajñāyajñīya. Wherever they occur and reoccur in succession, there one should arrange them based on strophes of three verses, not on single verses. One should not be an arranger of single verses. The single verse has no strength. The single verse is this world. This world is cut off as it were from the other two.

The strophe of three verses has more continuity in its strength. There are three worlds here. The strophes of three verses are these worlds. Three are stronger than one. Therefore in this world someone who possesses more values the inferior less than himself. One achieves a greater piece of pasture land and greater prosperity with the strophe of three verses. With the single verse one achieves a smaller piece of pasture land and less prosperity.

But the single verse is indeed superior to the strophe of three verses. The word *ekarca* consists of three syllables, the word *tṛca* of two. But he who knows about these, namely about the threefold strophes consisting

of (three) verses and the threefold strophes consisting (as words) of (two) syllables: "Both are made by me", by him both kinds of threefold strophes are made. Moreover, since there is an Ṛc, a Sāman and a Hiṃ-sound, therefore threefold strophes are made by him. Moreover, since there are a Prastāva, a Pratihāra and a finale, therefore also one does not miss the threefold strophes.

V. 11. *Survey of the Agniṣṭoma and characterisation of its lauds* (312–314)

312. Prajāpati remains creating creatures at that moment of the Morning Pressing which is the Out-of-doors laud. Having become that deity he (i.e. the Udgātṛ) sits down near the Āstāva. The world of this deity is the same as that of him who knows thus[1].

Then the Ājya dedicated to Agni. That is an Abhijit Stoma[2]. That is Agni. For he conquered all this[3].

Then the Ājya dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa. That is a Viśvajit Stoma[4]. This is night and day. Mitra is the day, Varuṇa the night[5]. Therefore night and day reach all the worlds on this side of the sun. But on the other hand they do not reach the world of him who knows thus[6].

Then the Ājya dedicated to Indra. That is a Sarvajit Stoma[7]. That is Indra. For he conquered all here.

Then the Ājya dedicated to Indra and Agni. That is an Udbhid Stoma[8]. That is Indra and Agni. For they rose up (*udabhinttām*) above everything here (i.e. above the other gods) at the running of a race.

313. Then the Midday Pavamāna laud. That is a Dhanajit Stoma[9]. That is Vāyu. For having become breath he conquered (*ajayat*) all wealth (*dhana*). Therefore, whatever a living being wins[10], he who knows thus, gets a share in it.

The (first) Pṛṣṭha laud is a Rathantara or a Bṛhat. That is a Śrī Stoma[11]. The Pṛṣṭha is prosperity (*śrī*)[12].

Then the Vāmadevya. That is a Śānti Stoma[11]. That is water[13]. When Agni Vaiśvānara burned down this earth, then they extinguished it (the fire) with water. Both the hot season and the cool season are Agni Vaiśvānara. The rainy season is placed in between them[14] in order to extinguish.

Then the Brahmasāman which is either the Naudhasa or the Śyaita. That is a Sarvacchandas Stoma[11]. That is Brahman. For Brahman is all metres.

Then (the fourth Pṛṣṭha) the Kāleya. This is a Stoma that is sap (or: taste, *rasa*). It is food. The world of sap, i.e. of food, is the world of him who knows thus.

Then the Ārbhava Pavamāna. That is a Stoma that is unbound (*asita*). That is the quarters of space[15]. The quarters of space go apart so that

evil does not bind him[16]. Evil does (or: did) not bind them. Him who knows this evil does not bind.

Then the Yajñāyajñīya. That is a Stoma which represents the celestial vault (*nāka*)[17]. It is the sun. For this one does not rise against the benefit (*nākam = na akam*) of anybody[18]. Having become that deity he sits down near the Āstāva. The world of this deity is the same as that of him who knows thus[18].

This is the power of the Stomas (*stomendriyam*). These are powerful among the Stomas. He who knows thus becomes powerful and gets a share in everything here.

314. In the beginning Prajāpati forsooth was here. He desired: "May I be everything here; may I become superior to everything here". Having become Agni he won[19] the battles. Having become (*bhūtvā*) the earth (*bhūmi*) he became (*abhavat*) the past (*bhūtam*) and the future (*bhavyam*). Having become water (*āpas*) he obtained (*āpnot*) everything. Having become mind (*manas*) he imagined (*amanuta*) everything. Having become speech he pervaded[20] everything. Having become sight he saw everything. Having become hearing he heard everything. Having become the wind he became the lifebreath of the creatures. Having become the space he supported heaven. Having become heaven he expanded over everything. Having become lightning he became the sun. Having become desire (*kāma*) he became Ananta. Having become Ananta he became Death. Having become the year he did not become exhausted. He who knows thus does not become exhausted. Having become the moon he enclosed the halfmonths. Having become Parjanya he became the origin of the creatures[21]. Having become sacrifice he supports the gods.

These creatures created by him were not recognizable. Having become name he entered them. They are recognized by name: "This is X the son of Y".

"The Agniṣṭoma is the one that shines there, it is Indra, Prajāpati, this Universe" thus one should consider.

V. 12. *The Morning Service* (315–321)

Auswahl, 123–124
JB. 1, 97–104; 259–273; PB. 7, 1; ṢaḍvB. 2, 1–3

315. He sings the Retasyā[1]. The Retasyā is seed (*retas*). (This is done) for the sake of the continuity and uninterruptedness[2] of the seed[3]. He sings without a Hiṃkāra. The Hiṃkāra is a Vajra[4]. If he should utter the Hiṃkāra, he would split the seed[3].

When there is a one-day sacrifice, on that day one should sing it without the Hiṃkāra. For that day is one (and not to be divided).

When there is a sacrifice of two days, one should sing it on both days without the Hiṃkāra. For the one of the two is the beginning, the other is the end.

When there is a sacrifice of three days, they deliberate: "Should one utter the Hiṃkāra in that (sacrifice) or should one not utter it?". As to this some say: "One may freely sing the Retasyā without the Hiṃkāra during a whole year even from day to day. For during a year the seed which has been emitted, comes to effect. (This is done) for the sake of the coming to effect of the seed". As to this on the other hand Śāṭyāyani said: "The seed which has been emitted on the first day, that becomes an embryo. And what has been emitted afterwards, that gets lost when it becomes emitted". Therefore one may sing the Retasyā without the Hiṃkāra on the first day and sing it with the Hiṃkāra on the other days. Moreover the Hiṃkāra means food[5], for by food the embryo grows. (Thus it is done) for the sake of growth. One should sing it at the end, thinking: "Let the beginning be the end".

316. Galunas Ārkṣākāyana Śālāpatya learnt these from Āruṇi. They are called the Dhūrs of Āruṇi. Now they say: "What metre has the Retasyā?". One should say: "The Bṛhatī". "Why the Bṛhatī?". "For the Retasyā is mind"[6] one should say. "There is nothing firmer (*bārhīyas*) than mind. And on the other hand all the vital powers are equal to mind. All the metres are equal to the Bṛhatī[7]. Therefore the Retasyā is a Bṛhatī verse". "Whereby is it developed (eminent)?". "It is developed", he should say "in that it is called Retasyā. For from seed (*retas*) everything here becomes developed. It is developed in that it is (to be equated with) mind and that it is (to be equated with) this deity, the moon." The Retasyā is the moon. King Soma (i.e. the moon) is food of the gods[8] and the counterpart of seed[9]. It is the sap of everything here, which has been completely pressed upwards[10]. All gods live upon it. Therefore they say: "King Soma is Brahman[11], for all gods live upon him". The Retasyā is Brahman[12]. By him who knowing thus praises with the Retasyā there has been praised with the Brahman.

317. He sings the Gāyatrī. The Gāyatrī is breath[13]. He intertwines two syllables of this (Gāyatrī)[14]. The result of the transposition is *om ātharvāṇo̍ āśiśrāde3yurvaṃ devāya dā*. That is breath, that is the wind.

He sings the Triṣṭubh. The Triṣṭubh is sight. He makes two of its syllables manifest[15]. Singing *ṣodhā* he makes these two manifest. That is this faculty of sight (or: these two eyes). This is yonder sun.

He sings the Jagatī. The Jagatī is hearing. He makes four of its syllables manifest. Singing *somāś śukrāh* he makes two words manifest which have connections with *śukra*[16]. That is this faculty of hearing. That is these quarters of space.

He sings the Anuṣṭubh. He sings it pushing against it so that it turns in

this direction[17]. Singing *o3vājaṃ vājy akāmā3* he sings one verse-quarter manifestly. He clearly pronounces *nuṣa*. That is speech. That is Prajāpati.

He sings the Paṅkti. The Paṅkti is the seasons. He makes six[18] of its syllables manifest. Singing *pavasvā sūryā* he makes two words manifest that are connected with the sun[19].

318. They are the six seasons[18].

These powers are the six Dhūrs. By means of them the gods caused the Asuras to fall (*adhūrvan*). Because they caused to fall (*adhūrvan*) therefore the Dhūrs were called Dhūrs[20]. By him who knows thus there is praised with all these powers. He who criticizes someone who knows thus, becomes cut off[21] from all these powers.

Arguing that the embryos are not born without any distinction some people[22] discern the Paṅkti (out of the Gāyatrī) when they sing (this Dhūr)[23] with the words *sāṃjagmāno dāyivā kovā pavasvā sūryāḥ*. As to this Śāṭyāyani used to say: "If they do not[24] discern this Paṅkti from the Gāyatrī) in singing (the sixth Dhūr), then the embryos become confused (i.e. they cannot be discerned anymore). From the moment that the embryos come forth (or: are extended) they are born. Therefore one should sing this (Paṅkti) extended into a Gāyatrī[25]". Now they say: "He who is able to sing together, may now sing these Dhūrs apart (i.e. distinguish the several metres from the Gāyatrī)". As to this some say: "In the Bahiṣpavamāna while singing apart (the Dhūrs) we still sing them together. When we make them with a finale consisting of the word *vāc*, namely *o vā*[26], they thereby become chanted as a unity". Thereby they are honoured (?) in the Ājyas, not in the Pavamānas.

Some say: "It is in the Ājya Stotras that while singing apart (the Dhūrs) we sing (them) as a unity".

(One sings) the Jagatī[27] in the Ājya Stotra (belonging to the first Ājya Śastra, the Praügaśastra) of the Hotṛ. For the Hotṛ is connected with the Jagatī.

319. The text begins with *agna ā yāhi vītaye*[28].

(One sings) the Gāyatrī (in the Ājya Stotra belonging to the second Ājya Śastra) of the Maitrāvaruṇa. For the Maitrāvaruṇa is connected with the Gāyatrī. The text begins with *ā no mitrāvaruṇa*[28].

(One sings) the Triṣṭubh (in third Ājya Stotra belonging to the Ājya Śastra) of the Brāhmaṇacchaṃsin. For the Brāhmaṇacchaṃsin is connected with the Triṣṭubh. The text begins with *ā yāhi suṣumā hi te*[28].

(One sings) the Anuṣṭubh (in the fourth Ājya Stotra belonging to the Ājya Śastra) of the Acchāvāka. For the Acchāvāka is connected with the Anuṣṭubh. Its text begins with *indrāgnī ā gataṃ sutam*[28].

Thereby they are also properly sung as to their appearance. He who having sung them in the Morning Pressing sings them in the Midday Pressing and in the Third Pressing, by him they are sung each in his own

place. He who first sings these which have the second pressing and the third pressing as their own places in the first pressing, causes them to fall from their own position. But he who having sung them in the first pressing thereupon sings them in their own places. They are sung by him as having their own place; they are sung here together.

320. Thus spoke Addhiya, the descendant of Satyayajña[29]: "There is prosperity[30] among his own people for him who knowing thus does not sing apart the Dhūrs". "Therefore, if someone sings the other Dhūrs apart, he should not[31] sing apart the Dhūrs of the Out-of-doors laud and of the Ājya-lauds". As to this Śāṭyāyani also remarked: "They who sing the Dhūrs apart, draw them apart (i.e. destroy them). If (one sings) Triṣṭubhs, one places the essence of the Midday Service in the Morning Service. If one sings a verse which is of the kind of the Rathantara Sāman, one places the essence of the Rathantara chanted in the Pṛṣṭha Stotras in the Morning Service. If he sings a Jagatī verse, he places the essence of the Jagatī used in the Third Service in the Morning Service. If he sings an Anuṣṭubh verse,—the Anuṣṭubh is speech—he places this (speech) in the Morning Service. This speech, the Anuṣṭubh, which has become obstructed in the Morning Service, is not adequate for anything (else)".

Even if one were to bestow an Ājya sacred to Agni on them, these two Services would be empty and exhausted. And (this is) also (the case) if the two are the same. If one wants to sing in one and the same sacrifice in two ways, these essences become spilt and exhausted. That is also drawn apart. It is good not to accomplish this (Anuṣṭubh). Therefore one should sing *o vā o vā*.

There are also two Dhūrs, mind and speech. Speech is produced by mind. This speech has mind as its guide. Therefore mind brings speech towards (its object). And speech in its turn again brings thought (or mind) towards something. The sound produced by thought (mind) and speech is—

321. —Indra. Indra is all the gods. He who knowing thus sings as an Udgātṛ makes (the sacrificer) go to heaven. And the other (Udgātṛs, who do not know thus) make him go to the world of the Gandharvas or the world of the Pitṛs. Moreover by means of these two Dhūrs all Dhūrs become obtained by him[32].

Prajāpati created the sacrifice. He gave it to the gods. With the Gāyatra he gave the Morning Service, with some (other) chants[33] the Midday Service and the Third Service. The Midday Service started with the Āmahīyava chant, the Third Service with the Saṃhita chant. Therewith they performed the sacrifice. For them the head, namely the Gāyatra, became developed. The gods went to Prajāpati and said: "Forsooth, there was apparently[34] only one chant successful, the

Gāyatra. Our head, the Gāyatra, has become developed. Arrange for us the sacrifice in such a way that we become immortal (as a result of the sacrifice) with all our limbs and with a complete body".

He tore the six Gāyatras out of the Morning Service. Three he added to the Midday Service (namely before the Āmahīyava), three to the Third Service (namely before the Saṃhita).

They said: "What will become of that from which you took this?". He said: "I shall insert the metres there. They will be called after the metres (namely as the Dhūrs). Because he said "I shall insert the metres there. They will be called after the metres", therefore they (the Dhūrs) though being Gāyatrīs are called after the metres.

Then they performed the sacrifice[35] with a new way of chanting (i.e. with the Dhūrs). They became immortal with all their limbs and complete bodies. He who knows thus becomes immortal with all his limbs and with a complete body.

. "[36].

Thus spoke Śāṭyāyani.

V. 13. *The Midday Service* (322–335)

Auswahl, 124–128
JB. 1, 116–155

322[1]. And then this Āmahīyava (Sāman) which is sacred to Prajāpati[2], is employed at the beginning of the pressing. That which is sacred to Prajāpati is automatically praiseworthy. In this (chant) which is praiseworthy[3] even more praise is added by beginning with Om. This syllable is yonder sun. This syllable is that part of the three Vedas which is not pressed out[4]. By beginning with Om one places yonder sun at the beginning. Just as one might mix beans with honey[5] one places sap in the Sāman by means of this syllable. One makes it swell. With this swollen (Sāman) which is full of sap there is praised by him.

"The Sāman in which a Pratihāra is applied[6] sinks down" thus say the Kurus. "By making a raising (*ud-gṛh*) (in the chanting) after the Pratihāra one makes it rise again". Moreover a Sāman is thereby chanted on top of a Sāman[7]. Chanting a Sāman on top of a Sāman is good chanting. Thinking "I chant a Sāman on top of a Sāman" one knows "I shall hereby reach the highest position among my own people".

The Prastotṛ sings (as Prastāva of the Raurava, the third Sāman of the Midday laud): *punānas soma dhārayā* ("Purifying yourself (you flow), o Soma, in streams")[8]. (The Udgātṛ sings as Udgītha) *apo vasāno arṣasi* ("Clothing yourself in water you flow"), which are eight syllables; *ā ratnadhā yonim ṛta-* ("Giving riches (you take your seat) on the place where the cosmic order is regulated") by means of this number of eight

(syllables) one arrives at sixteen. (The last syllables of the Udgītha) *-sya sīdasi* ("you take your seat") are four. The sixteen (syllables) then are the sixteenfold cattle[9]. The four are the (four) teats of this cattle. "Just as one may milk a piece of cattle that has an udder and whose milk has been made to flow[10], so one may milk every wish from this (Sāman) by means of this way of singing. It is (a Sāman) providing cattle", thus said Sucitta Śailana; "He becomes rich in cattle who knowing thus sings the Raurava".

323. "Someone who is desirous of progeny should start the Udgītha while the Prastāva of the Sāman is still being chanted. Someone who is desirous of supremacy starts to sing the Udgītha after the Prastāva has been removed. Someone who is longing for cattle should still sing the Udgītha while the Pratihāra has already started[11]. Performing the finale which has a particular tone one should think about one's fame as a Vedic scholar. For fame as a Vedic scholar is tone. These are the four aims with relation to the Sāman" thus spoke Jānaśruteya. And Vaitahavya used to say: "There are three aims with relation to the Sāman. What one does with speech that is progeny. For speech is born from mind (thought). One should know: 'Whatever I do with speech—that is my progeny—thereby I shall obtain progeny'. And that one sings a verse, that means cattle. For verse (*ṛc*) means cattle. One should know: 'When I sing a verse—that is my cattle—then I shall thereby become rich in cattle'. And when one performs a finale which has a particular tone, then that means fame as a Vedic scholar. For tone is fame as a Vedic scholar. He should know: 'When[12] I perform the finale with a particular tone—that is my fame as a Vedic scholar—then I shall thereby obtain fame as a Vedic scholar'. For him who knows thus all aims are obtained here."

The syllable Om is a syllable expressing truth. The finales of the Yaudhājaya Sāman are forsooth a thunderbolt. Having sung with this truth in the form of the syllable Om the gods killed evil in the form of their rivals, the Asuras. In the same way he who knowing thus sings with this truth namely Om kills by means of these finales of the Yaudhājaya the evil in the form of his rival, his adversary.

It has three endings[13]. These worlds are three. These finales are a thunderbolt. By means of these thunderbolts he strikes away for himself all evil from these worlds. Moreover these same thunderbolts after having struck away all evil in these worlds rise[14] to heaven with the syllable Om.

324. Then this Auśana Sāman chanted on Triṣṭubh verses. When the gods and the Asuras were at strife, he (Uśanas?)[15] spoke among them: "I am thrice (*trir*) *ṣṭubh*". Because he said: "I am thrice *ṣṭubh*", therefore the Triṣṭubh is called Triṣṭubh. Having thrice praised with this

verse the gods killed evil in the form of the hating rival. In the same way he who knowing thus praises thrice with this verse kills evil in the form of his hating rival. One makes three risings in this Sāman. Yonder sun is related to the threefold Triṣṭubh in that it consists of white, black[16] and the man in the sun[17]. This eye is related to the threefold Triṣṭubh in that it consists of white, black and the man in the sun. Thus one sings making a correlation with the highest deity. He who knowing thus sings the Auśana reaches the highest position among his own people.

325. And now the removal and pushing back connected with the Sāman. When the Hiṃkāra is applied in the Sāman one should remove in thought him whom one hates to that[18] direction; and from the same moment he becomes lost. When the Pratihāra is applied, one should push back in thought him whom one hates to that same direction; and also from that same moment he becomes lost.

There are also three heavens and three hells of the Sāman. The moment after the Prastāva[19] and before the beginning (Ādi), that is a hell. Having made fall one's hating rival there the beginning is heaven for him. Therein he places himself. The moment after the Pratihāra and before the Upadrava is a hell. Having made fall one's hating rival there the Upadrava is heaven for him. Therein he places himself. The moment after the Upadrava and before the finale is a hell. Having made fall one's hating rival there the finale is a heaven. Therein he places himself.

As to this also Śāṭyāyani said: "That part of the Sāman which comes after the Prastāva is free from evil. That[20] is heaven. Who would give his hating rival a share in it? The moment after the Prastāva and before the beginning is one hell. Having made fall his hating rival there one should place oneself in the whole Sāman. And thereupon the sacrificer. Having struck off evil he comes to heaven. It is having done this that one thinks to be superior".

326. He who performs his priestly function on the basis of Ṛc and Sāman which have a good support obtains a good support himself. The Prastāva is the good support of the Ṛc in the Sāman. That he sings the rest of the Sāman after the Prastāva in a veiled (i.e. unexpressed) way, that is the good support of the Sāman in the Ṛc. The Pratihāra is the good support to the Ṛc in the Sāman. That he sings the rest of the Sāman after the Pratihāra in a veiled way, that is the good support[21] of the Sāman in the Ṛc. The finale is the good support of the Ṛc in the Sāman. That one makes an *atisvāra*[22] in the finale that is the good support of the Sāman in the Ṛc. He who thus performs his priestly function on the basis of Ṛcs and Sāmans that have a good support comes into the possession of a good support himself.

There are two entities here: Ṛc and Sāman. That which is the truth of these two in the creatures, that wins the world that can be won by truth.

Speech is the truth of the Ṛc, mind the truth of the Sāman. These two are the truth of Ṛc and Sāman. Truth comes to stay among the creatures and wins that world which can be won by truth. One should sing the Sāman with the truth of the Ṛc and the Ṛc with the truth of the Sāman. And Ṛc and Sāman rule the world of heaven. These two make him go to heaven. He who sings these two in this way rules the world of heaven. Therefore these two should be sung thus.

327. He who is going to praise with the Rathantara touches the earth reciting: "Honour to mother earth, o Rathantara, do not harm me"[23].

Then he collects the powers: "Your power that is in the fire, that is in the water, that is in the chariot, that is in the thunder, that is in the wind, unite yourself with that and be bestowing goods to us"[24].

And before the Vāmadevya[25] he should utter the expiatory formulas: "You are Prajāpati, o Vāmadevya, the protection of brahman, protect me".

Then he utters the immortal utterances *bhūr bhuvaḥ svar* (and) "Who (or: Ka = Prajāpati) will act as the Udgātṛ; he will act as the Udgātṛ". Prajāpati is Ka. Him he elects as priest in the beginning. He who thus undertakes the Udgātṛship, for him there is worked with his (i.e. Prajāpati's) voice. He becomes free from debt himself.

Then he breathes on it (i.e. on the Prastāra?)[26]. There is extinction in breath and Bṛhat and Rathantara are fire. He extinguishes these two with breath. If one sings these two, Bṛhat and Rathantara, without[27] having extinguished them, young and healthy Brahmins versed in the Veda automatically perish here after the Vāmadevya.

328. Just as one may lift up a cauldron filled with hot milk from the fire by taking hold of it with two tongs, in the same way one lifts up here Bṛhat and Rathantara by taking hold of them with two Vāmadevyas. He who knowing thus sings the Bṛhat and the Rathantara reaches a complete lifetime.

The Rathantara is this earth (regarded as a cow). The sun is her calf. When one sings the Stobhas *bhā bhā*, one sings placing this sun in one's mouth[28]. Just as one may milk a cow whose milk has been made to flow by bringing her into contact with her calf, one milks every wish from the Rathantara by this way of singing.

The Ratharanta is prosperity. For this (prosperity) these Stobhas are whatever (grows) on this earth. This prosperity cannot be obtained outside the syllables (of the verse on which the Ratharanta Sāman is based). If one makes the Stobhas on the syllables (i.e. replaces the syllables by the Stobhas), one obtains prosperity and becomes firmly established in this (prosperity). This prosperity which is in the syllables is only found there. Therefore the Stobhas should be made on (i.e. instead of) the syllables.

329. The Rathantara outside the syllables has no roots. For they who make the Stobhas outside the syllables, lose their support here. And he who makes the Stobhas on the syllables becomes firmly established in his own support (position, "establishment"). Therefore the Stobhas should be made on the syllables.

Śāṭyāyani used to say: "The Kurus and Pañcālas lost their strong position by singing the vital powers (*devatā-gāyinaḥ*)". Thought (or: mind) comes first, then speech[29]. The Bṛhat is the mind, the Rathantara speech. When Bṛhat and Rathantara ran their race, Bṛhat won the race and Rathantara was left behind. By chanting the Rathantara quickly, one makes thought and speech equal (i.e. arriving at the same time). Then this Rathantara thinks: "Come, let him who has made me equal (to the Bṛhat) quickly get rid of[30] evil". Quickly he gets rid of evil who knowing thus quickly sings the Rathantara.

330. He should quickly sing it, with full cheeks and without blowing away[31]. The Rathantara is prosperity. Thereby he places prosperity in himself. On the other hand the Rathantara is fire. One should try quickly to be freed of it. Where fire stays burning, there the herbs take a long time, so to say, to spring forth. Where it moves softly touching (lit.: blowing) (the earth), there the herbs quickly spring forth[32]. Thinking: "Let me be quickly productive with offspring and cattle" the Udgātṛ should speak *iḷā*[33] at every Pratihāra. The *iḷā* means cattle. The Rathantara is a house with a piece of land[34]. Herein he places this cattle.

Some people make a uniform Stobha, namely *bhā bhā*, thinking "Yonder sun is *bhās* (lustre)". As to this Śāṭyāyani observed: "That which is uniform does not form a couple and is not productive. Yonder world is the dispenser (*bhaga*)[35], this world the female part (the 'split' *bhid*). Yonder world is a man, this world a woman. When yonder world rains, then this world produces everything. And when a man pours seed in a woman, then she produces offspring. Therefore the Stobha should be made in the form of a procreative couple, namely *abhubhābhibhabhebhabha*[36]".

As long as one makes the Stobhas, both hands should be on the earth[37], in order that the cosmic chariot does not rock.

331. He makes sixteen Stobha syllables. Man consists of sixteen parts[38]. Thereby he pours the sacrificer part by part[39] in this divine womb. He is born from this divine womb (and arrives) among[40] the gods. He makes fourteen Stobhas in the second and the third verses. Out of these ten are the Virāj. The Virāj is food. And four are the fourfooted cattle. He obtains fourfooted cattle.

He makes sixteen Stobha syllables. Out of these fifteen are the fifteenversed chant, which is identical with the thunderbolt[41]. And the sixteenth syllable is Indra. Indra as the wielder of the thunderbolt is the

sixteenth. He has made the sacrificer equal to Indra. The Udgātṛ thereby lays down the evil in the form of the hating rival of the sacrificer by means of the fifteenfold one, the thunderbolt. He makes fourteen Stobha syllables in the second and in the third verse. That is a thunderbolt with a handle missing[42] in both cases. Thereby the Udgātṛ cleaves the rival of the sacrificer in the own home of the rival. He brings the rival to destruction in the home of the rival. For him who knows thus there is no rival at all.

He makes sixteen Stobha syllables and fourteen in the second and third verse. That makes forty-four syllables. The Triṣṭubh metre has forty-four syllables. The Triṣṭubh is Indra. Indra becomes established[43] in the midst of the metres. There are many metres before and many follow.

332. The metres are all Stomas, all animals, all gods, all worlds (i.e. all kinds of heaven), all desires. Thus one obtains all Stomas, all animals, all gods, all worlds, all desires.

The Rathantara is Agni[44] (or: fire) and Agni is death[45]. He who makes the Stobhas outside the syllables, that Udgātṛ throws the sacrificer in the mouth of death. And he who makes the Stobhas on (the place of) the syllables—the Stobha is also food—covers the mouth of death with every Stobha (i.e. fills it with food) and makes him pass this death. Moreover the Rathantara is an ocean. He who makes the Stobhas outside the syllables, enters this ocean and he who makes the Stobhas on the syllables crosses the ocean as one may go from the one island to the other by means of a ship or boat.

The words "seeing heaven (or: the sun)" he explicitly pronounces (i.e. does not replace by Stobhas). When one goes to heaven, one becomes immortal. He (the Udgātṛ) announces him (the sacrificer) to all the gods and all the spirits: "This brahmin has gone to heaven. He has become immortal". All the gods and all the spirits notice him.

333. Then this Vāmadevya. Up to the Pratihāra it should be sung without taking breath—for the Vāmadevya is breath[46]—(thinking) "lest I become cut off from my breath".

It should also not be sung along the way of someone else[47]. He who sings along the way of someone else runs the risk of becoming dependent upon him. It should be sung independently[47].

As to this Brahmadatta Caikitāneya said: "The Vāmadevya is soiled as it were and shaken out so to say—for the Sāmans have been created from it[48]—as an old bucket or a mule with weathered shoulders[49]. For it leads every Pṛṣṭha"[50].

In this (Vāmadevya Sāman) he should either sing the characteristics of the Pṛṣṭhas (namely Rathantara, Bṛhat, Vairūpa etc.) or before singing the Udgītha he should pronounce the formula: "cow, horse,

goat, sheep, rice, barley"[51]. The cow is the Rathantara, the horse is the Bṛhat, the goat is the Vairūpa, the sheep is the Vairāja, the rice is the Śākvarī-verses, the barley is the Revatī-verses[52]. Thus he places these (animals and herbs) which have been produced from this sap in it[53]. Thereby he makes it (the Vāmadevya) thrive. With this thriving (Sāman) full of sap there is praised by him.

If he desires rain he should utter "water, wind, water, wind" before he praises with the Vāmadevya. Thus there is rain for him. The Vāmadevya also means cattle. He who knowing thus praises with the Vāmadevya comes into possession of the cattle.

If he sings it after having correlated it with the worlds of Brahman, there is a good singing of the Brahmasāman (i.e. the third Pṛṣṭha laud, the Naudhasa Sāman)[54]. He makes seven raisings in the Brahmasāman. Brahman is in the seventh world. He makes four raisings in the words *vāso māndāno vā* and three in *āndhāsā bhī vātsān no vā*. That amounts to seven.

334. The world in which Agni here resides is called Upodaka ("lying upon the (subterranean) waters")[55], in which Vāyu resides Ṛtadhāman ("place where the cosmic order is realized"), in which the sun resides Aparājita ("unconquerable"), in which Varuṇa resides Abhidyu ("on heaven")[56], in which Death resides Pradyu (the third heaven connected with the Pitṛs: "further heaven"), in which Hunger[57] resides Rocana ("luminous"). The seventh world, the Brahmaloka, in which Brahma resides, is called Viṣṭapa ("top"). Thus one should place oneself in the Brahmaloka, in the Viṣṭapa ("top"), by means of the seventh raising; and also the sacrificer. And he makes it (i.e. the Brahmasāman) go there (to the Brahmaloka). When this (Brahmasāman) touches as it were (the Brahmaloka), then he causes it to be abundantly furnished with its own destination. And regarding this Sucitta Śailana used to raise the point: "Saying *svā sā rādhiṣu dhenovā*[58] he makes him go to the Brahmaloka and causes him to be abundantly furnished with his own destination. And thereby he causes it (the Brahmasāman) to be abundantly furnished with its own destination and thus to be thriving. And thereby he causes him (the sacrificer) to return to this world and to complete a full lifetime"[59].

335. Then this Kāleya Sāman. He should sing it in such a way that he seems to spread it, that he gives it energy[60] so to say, that he avoids as it were to give any obstruction to it. "Just as a well-loaded (cart) laden with barley or with beans[61] may go", thus the Brahmins of the Kurus used to consider, "even so is the situation of the Kāleya. It should be sung in such a way that one extends it (i.e. makes it broad like the load of a cart)".

Now some people apply every time this: *hoyiḷā*[62] as an ascending[63] Iḷā in the Rathantara (version of the Kāleya) Sāman. As to this Śāṭyāyani

used to say: "This Iḷā is lifted up so to say, it is expelled as it were. Applying a downward directed[64] Iḷā at the end one should make a raising in the word *dhoro*[65] of the second Stotra verse of the Bṛhat Sāman. Thereby one does not become excluded from the characteristics of the Bṛhat (the high one)". But some apply the ascending Iḷā in the Rathaṇtara as well as in the Bṛhat Sāman saying "This Iḷā is not blowing downwards, it is directed to heaven".

As to this Śāṭyāyani again said: "The Rathantara is Agni, the Vāmadevya is Vāyu, the Naudhasa is Indra, the Kāleya is the All-gods. Heaven is these All-gods. Thereby one becomes firmly established in heaven among the All-gods. If now someone should criticize them saying "They will become so or so"[66], then they would indeed become so. Therefore the Iḷā should be a low (or: downwards directed) one which one applies at the end, with a view to a complete lifetime on earth and lest one becomes kicked out".

V. 14. *The Third Service* (336–341)

Auswahl, 128–130
JB. 1, 156–178

336.[1] Then this Saṃhita, which is Brahman. It is applied at the beginning of the (Third) Service. Brahman is automatically praiseworthy. In this (chant) which is praiseworthy even more praise is added by beginning with Om. This syllable is yonder sun. This syllable is that part of the three Vedas which is not pressed. By beginning with Om one places yonder sun at the beginning. Just as one might mix beans with honey one places sap in the Sāman by means of this syllable. One makes it swell. With this swollen (Sāman) which is full of sap there is praised by him.

"The Sāman in which a Pratihāra is applied sinks down", thus say the Kurus. "By making a raising (in chanting) after the Pratihāra one makes it rise again". Moreover a Sāman is thereby chanted on top of a Sāman. Chanting a Sāman on top of a Sāman is good chanting. Thinking "I chant a Sāman on top of a Sāman" one knows "I shall hereby reach the highest position among my own people".

337. The Uṣṇih and the Kakubh verses (chanted as Sabha and Pauṣkala Sāmans) should be sung without taking breath up to the Pratihāra. This metre is crushed as it were. The Uṣṇih and the Kakubh (together) are a metre suited to man.[2] As to this Śamastobhin Bālāki, who made his pupil Sāyaka Jānaśruteya Udgātṛ in his own sacrifice, cursed (him): "Forsooth, this Jānaśruteya has sung the Sāman in such a way that now his blood will spring up (out of his body)". Then the Ajinavāsins who were at war entered the Sadas hut. A club came down

upon him and made his blood spring up. He said: "How should one sing?". To him he (Bālāki) said this: "One should not make manifest[3] the word *asṛk*[4] (blood). He should sing (instead of this) *ho*. On the other hand one should not sing the whole Third Service in a veiled way. If someone should say about one who makes (all syllables) veiled: "This Udgātṛ has burnt himself and the sacrificer", that would take place. He should make manifest ".[5].

Then this Śyāvāśva Sāman. With (the Stobha) *aiho vā ehi yā* some people[6] sing (this Sāman). This (i.e. the syllable *vā*) is speech (*vāc*) and the Anuṣṭubh (used in the text on which this Sāman is sung) is speech. (One does so) thinking "By means of speech we must be firmly established in speech". When Brahmadatta Caikitāneya was singing it in this way Galunas Ārkṣākāyaṇa cursed him, saying: "This descendant of Dalbha has sung the Śyāvāśva in such a way that his own evil will step upon him". Then the other having noticed this said: "And he has sung the Vāmadevya in such a way that he will live emaciated and without cattle".

[7]Now this Brahmadatta Caikitāneya was appointed Purohita—

338. —by the king of the Kosalas Brahmadatta Prāsenajita. His (i.e. the king's) son talked like an Easterner. He (Caikitāneya) spoke: "This man (i.e. the son of the king) is not to be understood. Yoke my chariot. I shall come back". He went away. Then the Vailūnis fetched one of his (i.e. Caikitāneya's) countrymen, Jaimava, (to be Purohita?). He (Caikitāneya?) came to their assembly. He rose from the grass (used as cushion to sit on?) later than these[8]. Formerly he used to jump up. To him came two men who gave much and. . . . much[9]. He said: "Well, if that's how matters stand (i.e. if you offer me so much), then come here and let's have a discussion". Galūnas[10] said: "When Śyāvāśva, the son of Arcanānas, had gone away in order to fetch fuel (for the sacrifice) his fellow-sacrificers left him and went to heaven[11]. They called him with the Śyāvāśva Sāman, namely with the Stobha *aiho vā ehi* ("come") *yā*. The subject of a king (the *sajāta*) is left behind as it were. When one sings *aiho vā ehi yā*, one lets one's own evil step upon oneself". To him he (Caikitāneya?) said: "One should sing *ohoiyā*. Oho by name is Indra. The one that shines there is Indra. He is the same. All gods follow him. The own people of him who knowing thus sings the Śyāvāśva follow him".

339. And then the Āndhīgava which has a finale in the middle for the sake of stability. Whatever of the sacrifice is here ill praised, ill recited and defective, to that he thereby looks[12].

Then the Kava Sāman in which he makes risings five times. "The number five is identified with the Fifteenfold Stoma (?). The animals are fivefold[13]. The animals are the Jagatī[14]. These animals he spreads out

among the animals. Therefore it is a Sāman by which one obtains cattle", thus spoke Sucitta Śailana. "Of him who knowing thus sings the Kava the thread of the lineage is not cut off from his family". He considers this song as the line of the family and as the reaching of a place in heaven.

The Gāyatrī is this world, the Triṣṭubh the intermediate space and the Jagatī yonder world. Thus by means of the third raising one rises to heaven. "This Sāman procures cattle and it is leading to heaven" thus one says. One reaches both these aims.

340. [15]He who knows the udder of the sacrifice milks a sacrifice of which the milk has been made to flow. The Yajñāyajñīya forsooth is the udder of the sacrifice. Its teats are the Gāyatra, the Rathantara, the Bṛhat and the Vāmadevya Sāmans. Therefore one should make the Prastāva with the Gāyatra, make the Stobhas of the Rathantara, make the raisings as if they were of the Bṛhat. The Hiṃkāra is the Vāmadevya. It is the Yajñāyajñīya itself. The sacrificer milks this sacrifice. Having sacrificed he becomes better[15].

Ten times one makes a raising in it. Six times in the first two verses, four times in the last. This amounts to ten raisings. Ten syllables has the Virāj. The Virāj is food[16]. The Virāj is yonder one who shines. In that heaven they become established at the end.

One should sing the Ukthas in a hidden and various way. For the Ukthas are chanted in the day-time. During the night one should sing openly. The night is as it were covered from the point of view of the day. Now they say: "O, Udgātṛ, did you sing the night in the day-time or the day at night?". He should say "Both". "I have sung the night in the day-time and the day at night". The day is open. If one sings in it in a covered way, then one makes a productive couple (of hidden and open). The night is covered. If one sings in it openly, this is like placing light in darkness. Therefore one sings during the day-time with the characteristics of the night and during the night with the characteristics of the day.

341. That is well chanted. Moreover by singing thus one establishes night and day in each other. In that one sings during the day which is open in a covered way, therefore yonder sun does not burn everything here. And in that one sings during the night which is covered openly, therefore something can still be discerned during the night. If one should sing the night in a covered way darkness would be blind.

The Sāmans of the Agniṣṭoma are kings, the Sāmans of the ceremonies of twelve days are princes, the Chandasya Sāmans (?) the people. Therefore all these three kinds of Sāmans should be carried out in a year (i.e. in a sacrifice of one year). When the royalty lives like the people and like the princes there is success. This is like kingship which is in agreement with people and princes.

When these Sāmans are carried out in a (sacrifice of a) year, the way of singing is that of the Agniṣṭoma Sāmans. As a king may have paraphernalia such as the skin of a tiger[17], gold and diamonds, an elephant, a neck-ornament, a chariot with a she-mule, a chariot with a horse, a breast-ornament, a cup, in the same way these (Agniṣṭoma) Sāmans. Therefore one should sing the Sāmans of the Agniṣṭoma after having made then special songs and the other (Sāmans) just as they are sung, just as they are sung.

VI. EXPIATIONS (342–364)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (Sanskrit Section), Poona 1970, 605–686

TS. 3, 1, 7; 3, 2, 6; 7, 5, 5; KS. 34, 2–4; 35, 16; TB. 1, 4, 5–6; 1, 7, 4–7; 3, 7, 10, 4–6; TĀ. 2, 18; AB. 5, 32–34; ŚāṅkhB. 6, 10–12; PB. 9, 3–10; ŚB. 4, 5, 10; 11, 5, 8; ṢadvB. 1, 5, 7–9; 1, 6, 9–19; JUB. 3, 15–17; ChU. 4, 17; GB. 1, 3, 3; LŚS. 1, 11, 10–14; DŚS. 3, 3, 18–23; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 7–11 (no 37–46); Upagranthasūtra 1, 13; 2, 6–8; BŚS. 14, 4; 7; 9; 25–27; 29; 27, 4; 28, 9; 29, 3; 5; 13; ĀpŚS. 14, 18, 2–15; 19; 20, 1–4; 21, 8–13; 22; 23, 1–3; 12–15; 24, 7–21; 25, 5–11; 26, 1–2; 27; 29; 30, 2–6; 32, 7 (i.e. ĀpŚS. 14, 18–32); HirŚS. 15, 5, 5–23; 29–41; 6, 1–6; 12–20; 25–34; 7, 1–11; 13–25; 8, 33; VaiŚS. 20, 33; 21, 1; 4–11; 14–16; MŚS. 3, 6–8; KŚS. 25, 11–14; ĀśvŚS. 6, 6–10; ŚŚS. 13, 5–13; AthPr. 6, 3–7.

VI. 1. *The Saṃsava* (342–344)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 661; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.* I, 119–221; Mylius, "Der Saṃsava", *WZUH* 17 (1986), 117–137 (especially 127–128: tr. of JB. 1, 342–344).

TS. 3, 1, 7; 7, 5, 5; KS. 34, 4; PB. 9, 4; JB. 1, 359–361; TB. 1, 4, 6, 1–5; LŚS. 1, 11, 10–14; DŚS. 3, 3, 18–23; Upagranthasūtra 1, 13; BŚS. 14, 4; ĀpŚS. 14, 19; 14, 20, 1–4; HirŚS. 15, 5, 16–23; VaiŚS. 21, 5–6; MŚS. 3, 7, 4–7; KŚS. 25, 14, 8–27; ĀśvŚS. 6, 6, 11–18; ŚŚS. 13, 5; AthPr. 6, 6.

342. If two Soma sacrifices might happen to be held simultaneously, he (the Adhvaryu) should make the summons for the morning-litany in the dead of the night[1]. He is the first to appropriate the speech, the first to appropriate the deities, the first to appropriate the metres. The metres are all the gods. They appropriate all their[2] deities. He should try to be the first to draw up[3] the waters left standing overnight. The waters left standing overnight are all the gods[4]. They appropriate all their deities.

There should be offered in (a fire which is) well kindled. The fire is all the gods. Thereby they offer seeing all the deities (in the form of flames) in order to overcome the metres[5].

There should be offered in the Āgnīdhra fire. He (the Adhvaryu) should offer reciting "For lying down, for sitting down, in order to overcome the Gāyatrī, *svāhā*"[6] at the morning service, reciting "For lying down, for sitting down, in order to overcome the Triṣṭubh, *svāhā*" at the midday service, reciting "For lying down, for sitting down, in order to overcome the Jagatī, *svāhā*" at the third service. The gods overcame the Asuras by means of the metres. Those who simultaneously perform a Soma sacrifice, act like rivals as it were. By means of the metres they

overcome them[2]. There should be offered with verses dedicated to Prajāpati[7]. Prajāpati is all the gods[8]. They appropriate all their[2] gods.

343. If they were to desire "May their Adhvaryu die", they should say to the Adhvaryu at the morning service: "Offer with verses dedicated to Prajāpati". If they were to desire "May their Hotṛ die", they should say to the Hotṛ at the midday service: "Offer with verses dedicated to Prajāpati". If they were to desire "May their Udgātṛ die", they should say to the Udgātṛ at the third service: "Offer with verses dedicated to Prajāpati". For these are the regular positions of the priests. The Adhvaryu becomes engaged first. His regular position is the morning service. Then follows the Hotṛ. His regular position is the midday service. Then follows the Udgātṛ. His regular position is the third service. They win them each according to his own regular position[9]. If they were to desire "May their sacrificer die", they should say to the (own) sacrificer: "Offer with verses dedicated to Prajāpati". If they were to desire "May all of them die", all of them should offer at all the services[10].

Both the Rathantara and the Bṛhat should be used. These two, Rathantara and Bṛhat, are Indra's bay horses. The sacrifice is a divine (i.e. symbolical) chariot[11]. With Indra's bay horses and a divine chariot in the form of the sacrifice he wins the race. The Rathantara is this world, the Bṛhat yonder world. They exclude them[2] from the good couple this and yonder world, today and tomorrow[12].

344. The oblation of melted butter to Agni is offered with the formula "Forwards (should go) your oblations, to heaven" (ṚV. 3, 27, 1). For the well-known characteristic of the deities is something associated with forward; it is a characteristic that leads to overpowering[13]. They overcome them[2]. The Sāmans Ābhīka, Abhinidhana, Abhīvarta and Ābhīśava have a characteristic (namely the prefix *abhi*) which leads to overpowering[13]. They overcome them[2]. The relevant Śastras are the Vihavīya, the Sajanīya and the Kayāśubhīya of Agastya[14]. Because *vihavīyam* (the hymn containing the word *vihavam* as well as "he who is to be invoked by both parties")[15] is Indra, they thereby invoke the gods. They appropriate him with the hymn Sajanīya (containing the words *sa janāsa indraḥ* as well as meaning "belonging to the own people"). The Rakṣases pursued Agastya. He desired: "May I kill the Rakṣases". He saw this Śastra, the Kayāśubhīya. Thereby he struck off the Rakṣases. They who simultaneously perform a Soma sacrifice, are pursued as it were by the Rakṣases. The Kayāśubhīya Śastra serves for striking off the Rakṣases.

If the others should perform an Agniṣṭoma, then they should perform an Ukthya themselves. If the others should perform an Ukthya, then they should perform a Ṣoḍaśin themselves. If the others should under-

take a Ṣoḍaśin, they should perform an Atirātra themselves. If the others should perform an Atirātra, they should perform a Dvirātra themselves. If the others should perform a Dvirātra, they should perform a Trirātra themselves[16]. They apply more Stotras, more Śastras, more deities. This is a symbol of overpowering. They overcome them[2]. This is like the situation of two armies that stand[17] lined up against each other: more soldiers join (one of the two armies). As to this they also say: "One should intend this[18] sacrifice in mind ahead of (the others). One should strive to win it[19]. When two parties run a race, that one of the two wins which first reaches the turning-point[20]. One should try to reach the end (of the rite) first".

VI. 2. *Expiation for the death of one of the consecrated* (345–347)

KS. 34, 2; PB. 9, 8; TB. 1, 4, 6, 5–7; Kṣudrasūtra I, 11 (nr. 45); BŚS. 14, 27; ĀpŚS. 14, 21, 8–13; 14, 22; HirŚS. 15, 5, 29–41; VaiŚS. 21, 7–9; MŚS. 3, 8, 4–7; KŚS. 25, 13, 28–46; ĀśvŚS. 6, 10; ŚŚS. 13, 11; AthPr. 6, 7.

345. If someone of the consecrated (priests of a Sattra)[1] comes to die, they should after having cremated him and tied up his bones[2] and having distributed the Soma[3] consecrate someone who is nearest to him in relation and perform the sacrifice with him (as substitute). When they undertake (a sacrifice), they are consecrated for a common sacrifice, for a common benefit of it. Hereby (i.e. by the presence of the bones of the deceased) they give him his due share.

They should make the following changes: having anew[4] pressed out the Soma they (the chanters) should before taking the Somadraughts perform a laud at the Mārjālīya after the bones (of the cremated deceased) have been placed at the southern corner (of the Mahāvedi)[5]. They praise with the verses of Arbuda[6]. Arbuda was a snake. Thereby he removed his dead skin. They who perform a rite for a deceased, die as it were. By these (verses) they cast off the dead skin.

They praise with three verses. For the third world reckoned from here[7] is the world of the Pitṛs. They praise on verses that are thitherward (i.e. without repetitions). Thereby they make him go to yonder world without returning.

The Sāman is the Yāma[8]. Thereby they make him go to the world of Yama. This Sāman has no Prastāva and no Pratihāra[9]. The sacrificer is supported by Prastāva and Pratihāra. In that this Sāman has no Prastāva and no Pratihāra, thereby they give him a firm support in heaven.

They recite these verses after the laud beating their right thighs[10]. They go three times around the Mārjālīya hut turning their left side to it[11]. Thereby they fan[12] him in heaven. The wind blows towards him in yonder world.

Now they say: "They who perform a rite for a deceased, swerve from the path".

346. They take the Soma-draughts dedicated to Indra and Vāyu first. They return to the path[13].

Every laud should be illimited[14]. For yonder world is illimited[15]. Thereby they come to yonder world.

Now they say: "The Pavamāna lauds should be Trivṛts (threefolds). The other lauds are seventeenfold. The vital airs are threefold[16]. They who perform a rite for a deceased, become deprived of their vital airs. Because the Pavamāna lauds are threefold (or: Trivṛts), therefore they are amply furnished with vital airs. The other lauds are seventeenfold. Prajāpati is seventeenfold. Prajāpati is the one who leads to heaven. (They do so thinking:) "Let the one who leads to heaven, lead me to heaven". Otherwise the Pavamāna lauds may also be seventeenfold and the other lauds threefold (i.e. Trivṛts). They come indeed to someone who invites at the opening[17]. It is as if someone would invite with the first laud saying: "Do come to this side in this way". The other lauds are threefold (then). The vital airs are threefold. Thereby they go ascending to the vital airs.

Now they say: "They who perform a rite for a deceased, become deprived of in- and exhalation".

347. They take the Soma-draughts dedicated to Mitra and Varuṇa first. Mitra and Varuṇa are in- and outbreathing.

Now they say: "There should not be sacrificed for the bones before the end of the year (Sattra). If they should sacrifice for the bones before the end of the year, they would obtain a voice which is wounded and mangled. There should be sacrificed for the bones after the year, thinking: 'Lest I may obtain a voice which is wounded and mangled.'[18]".

Now they also say forsooth: "At the moment when the others descend to the final bath, they should throw away the bones. For their employment and abandonment are the same (as is the case with the other consecrated priests). There is abandonment in agreement with the abandonment of those (priests)".

VI. 3. *Expiation for leaving a Sattra half-way* (348)

Oertel, *Roots*, 41–42; Ghosh, *Fragments*, 85–87

PB. 9, 3, 1–2; TB. 1, 4, 7, 7; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 7 (nr. 35); Upagranthasūtra 1, 8–9; BŚS. 14, 29; ĀpŚS. 14, 23, 1–3; HirŚS. 15, 6, 1–6; VaiŚS. 21, 10; MŚS. 3, 8, 9; KŚS. 25, 11, 1–6; ĀśvŚS. 6, 6, 1; ŚŚS. 13, 13.

348. If they should rise from the sacrificial session halfway[1], they should sacrifice with a Viśvajit[2] overnight rite provided with all the (six) Pṛṣṭhas in which they give all property (as Dakṣiṇās). The Pṛṣṭhas are

the seasons[3]. The seasons are the year. Thereby the (full) year (of the Sattra) is reached by them. Through the Dakṣiṇās which they give they accomplish more[4] (than by the ordinary Sattra which is without Dakṣiṇās). And they also say: "They should sacrifice with the introductory overnight rite called Vaiśvānara". Night and day revolving reach the year. Thereby the year is reached by them. Through the Dakṣiṇās which they give they even accomplish more.

VI. 4 *Daybreak falls in before the Atirātra is finished* (348–349)

Oertel, *Syntax*, 259; *Roots*, 42–43; Ghosh, *Fragments*, 85–87
PB. 9, 3, 3–6; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 7, (nr. 36); ĀpŚS. 14, 23, 12–15; HirŚS. 15, 6, 31–34; MŚS. 3, 7, 2; ĀśvŚS. 6, 6, 1–10; ŚŚS. 13, 10, 4–11.

348. (continued)[1] If the day should break, when one round (of the Atirātra, i.e. the third and last round) is still not (completely) chanted[2], they should chant for the Hotṛ[3] on fifteen verses and for each of the others on five. If the day should break, when two rounds are still unchanted, they should chant for the Hotṛ and the Maitrāvaruṇa in the first round (of the two remaining rounds, i.e. the second round)[4] and for the Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin and the Acchāvāka in the second (of these two, i.e. in the third round). If the day should break when all the rounds are still unchanted, they should chant for the Hotṛ on six verses and for each of the others on three verses[5]. (Or) they should make the following changes for all of them[6], namely first apply eleven single verses and then in all cases a tercet dedicated to Indra. Thus did Mauñja Sāhaśravasa.

349. To him spoke Kapivana Bhauvāyana: "Forsooth, the great Sāhaśravasa has chanted with verses which.[7]. His offspring will become insane". "No" he (Sāhaśravasa) said; "it will become excellent in sacred learning". "(Sure), if he would have invited me", he (Kapivana) said, "(and) when he would have praised the Saṃdhi Stotra with a Rathantara Sāman on the tercet which starts with "O Agni, (bring) the matutinal (gift) of Uṣas"[8] after having applied twelve[9] single verses with a verse dedicated to Indra as twelfth. By "O Agni" he would not have become separated[10] from the characteristics of Agni, by "of Uṣas" from those of Uṣas, by "together with the Aśvins" from those of the Aśvins. His offspring would not have become insane, but would have become excellent in sacred learning". Nevertheless he (Sāhaśravasa) said to him: "They should not invite (you) if even if you.[11] this". "Then they are without learning". Some, however, hid themselves even when the sun had already risen[12]. Coming together during the next[13] night they sang their praises, arguing: "This is the former night which passed". They became successful. They who know thus become successful.

VI. 5 *Soma is left over* (350–351 beginning)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 643–645; 647–652
PB. 9, 7; TB. 1, 4, 5; ŚB. 4, 5, 10, 8; BŚS. 14, 25–26; ĀpŚS. 14, 18, 2–15; HirŚS. 15, 5, 5–15; VaiŚS. 21, 4; 16; MŚS. 3, 7, 9–10; KŚS. 25, 13, 1–19; ĀśvŚS. 6, 7; ŚŚS. 13, 7–9; BrPr. 103b (quoted in n. 1055 on AthPr. 6, 6).

350. If Soma is left over from the morning pressing, they should praise with "The cow of the Maruts sucks"[1] before the Mādhyaṃdina Pavamāna. They praise on Gāyatrī verses, for Soma is left over from morning pressing which is connected with the Gāyatrī. They praise on verses in which the Maruts are invoked, for Soma is left over for the (midday) pressing which is dedicated to the Maruts. They praise on verses which contain the verb *dhayati* ("to suck"). Thereby the cows of the Maruts suck[2]. The Stotra lasts as long as the Ājyastotra. The quantity of what they prepare depends on the quantity of what is left over.

If Soma[3] is left over from the Midday pressing, they should praise with "Verily, you are great, o Sun"[4] before the Ārbhavapavamāna. They praise on Bṛhatī verses, for Soma is left over from the pressing which is connected with the Bṛhatī. They praise on verses in which the sun is invoked, for Soma is left over for the (third) pressing which is dedicated to the sun. The Stotra lasts as long as the Pṛṣṭhastotra. The quantity of what they prepare depends on the quantity of what is left over.

If Soma is left over from the Third pressing, they should perform an Ukthya[5]. If it should be too much for[6] an Ukthya, they should perform a Ṣoḍaśin. If it should be too much for a Ṣoḍaśin, they should perform an Atirātra. There is, however, nothing voluntarily left over beyond the Atirātra.

Someone who is desirous of cattle should leave it over for cows. He should leave it over for the cows of a Vaiśya who possesses cattle. They praise the Bṛhat Sāman on Triṣṭubh verses. The Triṣṭubh is the Kṣatriya class and the Kṣatriya is the giver of cattle. "Let the giver of cattle give cattle to us" thus—

351. —is their afterthought on the Soma which is left over. Then one should speak: "Let not a second Vaṣaṭkāra. . . .". Having offered the. and having filled up again one should offer at the moment when the Anuvaṣaṭkāra is pronounced. If there should still be left over, it should stay there in the trough.

VI. 6 *Rain falls upon the Soma* (351, continued)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 610; 637
PB. 9, 9, 10–11; TB. 3, 7, 10, 6; BŚS. 29, 5; ĀpŚS. 14, 29, 2; HirŚS. 14, 7, 15;

VaiŚS. 21, 16; MŚS. 3, 6, 15; KŚS. 25, 12, 6–8; ŚŚS. 13, 12, 10; AthPr. 6, 3.

351. (continued). If rain should fall on King (Soma) (he should recite:) "The drop has gone down to the drop. I eat of you, o drop, that is powerful, sweet, wise and invited, I who am invited myself[1]. Taste[2] being delighted, must become satisfied"[3] (and drink the Soma). Now they say: "All immortal food comes down here to this world in the form of water. He should consume (the Soma upon which rain has fallen, thinking:) 'Forsooth[4] all immortal food has come here to this world'." That is the expiation in that case.

VI. 7. *The invitation (stotropākaraṇa) is made before the cup has been consumed* (351, end)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 638

PB. 9, 9, 12; TB. 3, 7, 10, 4–5; ĀpŚS. 14, 29, 1; HirŚS. 15, 17, 14; VaiŚS. 21, 16; MŚS. 3, 6, 19; KŚS. 25, 11, 33–34; ŚŚS. 13, 12, 11; Upagranthasūtra 2, 7; AthPr. 6, 3.

351 (end). If they should make the invitation to recite (i.e. the *stotropākaraṇa*) on a Soma-cup (which has not yet become consumed), he should keep covering it with his upper cloth. Thereby king (Soma) becomes not[1] paired with the Ṛc. The Adhvaryu should go taking with him this (cup) and all the while scattering (Soma from it)[2]. He should give it to someone who is truly benevolent to him, provided he should not[3] be a priest[4], keeping it from[5] the Sadas. Having cleansed it they should treat it equally to the other cups. That is the expiation in that case.

VI. 8. *The Soma trough breaks* (352)

Śrautakośa, II, 1 (S.S.), 628–633

TS. 7, 5, 5, 2; KS. 34, 4; PB. 9, 6; ŚB. 4, 5, 10, 7; BŚS. 14, 7; ĀpŚS. 14, 25, 10–11; 14, 26, 1–2; HirŚS. 15, 6, 26–30; VaiŚS. 21, 11; MŚS. 3, 6, 11; KŚS. 25, 12, 22–26; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 8 (no. 41); AthPr. 6, 4; 6.

352. If the Soma-trough should burst in the Morning Pressing, they should apply Bṛhatī verses dedicated to Viṣṇu in the Midday Pressing, namely "All this Viṣṇu brought"[1]. If the trough should burst in the Midday Pressing, they should apply Anuṣṭubh verses dedicated to Viṣṇu in the Ārbhavapavamāna, namely "Become purified in order to win the prize"[2]. If the trough should burst in the Third Pressing, they should perform an Ukthya and base their Brahmasāman on the verses "When you, Indra, with Viṣṇu. . . ."[3]. There is a hole in the sacrifice from the moment that the Soma trough bursts. They take hold of it with Viṣṇu who is identical with the sacrifice. For thereby it becomes protected by a

god[4]. The Sāman should have *vaṣaṭ* as finale[5]. These two are fires, this world and the Vaṣaṭkāra. By means of this Sāman there is offered in a kindled fire which is this world[6].

The Brahmasāman should be the Śrāyantīya. Thereby they make it (i.e. the hole) all right[7] (i.e. they fill it up). They produce the Yajñāyajñīya on Anuṣṭubh verses. The Yajñāyajñīya is speech[8], the Anuṣṭubh is speech[9]. Thereby they make it (i.e. the hole) complete[10] (again, i.e. they fill it up).

The Agniṣṭomasāman should be the Vāravantīya. The Vāravantīya is power and strength[11]. Thereby they make it complete with power and strength[12].

One should also try to catch[13] something of the scattered[14] Soma. Moreover one should wish (other) ready (Soma). One should say: "Fetch an other trough". Then one should stretch out a strainer over it with its fringe directed towards the north and one should pour a bit of it[15] (i.e. of the lost Soma) and then the (new) Soma in it. Or one should sprinkle something of the Āgrayaṇa cup in it and then pour some Ekadhana water to it[15]. One or two Ekadhana pitchers or how much as one may consider enough. That is the expiation in that case.

VI. 9. *The spilling of Soma and other mishaps to be expiated* (353)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 616; 634–637; 639

TS. 3, 2, 6; KS. 35, 16; TB. 1, 4, 7, 4; PB. 9, 9, 1–9; BŚS. 14, 9; 29; 29, 5; ĀpŚS. 14, 24, 7–8; 14, 27; 14, 30, 2–6; HirŚS. 15, 7, 1–11; 13; 18–25; VaiŚS. 21, 14–16; MŚS. 3, 6, 13; 17–18; KŚS. 25, 12, 1–5; 9–14; ŚŚS. 13, 12, 7; AthPr. 6, 3; 6.

353. If the Dhruva should overturn[1], one should scratch and turn upside down (the earth where the Soma has fallen) and then fill up (the Dhruva) with whatever is pure. If the Āgrayaṇa cup should overturn, one should fill it up from the others. The Āgrayaṇa cup is the self (or: body), the other (cups) are the breaths. The self is developed from the breaths, the breaths are developed from the self[2]. It (i.e. the Āgrayaṇa cup) lies near during all the pressings for the sake of the security of the sacrifice.

If the Pṛṣadājya (i.e. the speckled butter) should overturn, one should fill it up and again take it. If a dog should lick at it[3] or it should be (otherwise) not fit to be offered as an oblation, one should pour it on the Uttaravedi, cleanse the Sruc-ladle and take other (Pṛṣadājya).

If they should pour (Soma) on a Nārāśaṃsa cup which has been set down (after having been partially consumed)[4], this (cup) is no more to be consumed, since it has been offered already[5], nor to be offered, since it has already been consumed. One should pour it out between the enclosing pegs (of the Āhavanīya) and the ashes[6]. Some pour it with a

formula: "From the offered and the unoffered, from the unoffered and the offered, from the Soma which has been drunk and which has not been drunk, Indra and Agni, both of you must drink, the pressed out, *svāhā*"[7]. Śāṭyāyani said: "It should be done silently". Having cleansed the cup one should try to obtain something from the cup with which the Adhvaryu advances (at that moment). For they cause the breath to become exhausted of that one whose cup they let become exhausted[8]. A spoonful of Soma is breath[9]. Thereby they invigorate him with breath. If they should repeatedly[10] pour (new Soma) on (the remaining Soma of the Nārāśaṃsa cup), one should speak: "You should pour it away again" and then they should immediately fill it again. If they should sing (together as Sāmavedins)[11], even then they should split up (the amount of Soma, i.e. distribute it). If they should pass over in drinking, one should try to get an invitation. If one should be walking outside the Vedi at the moment when the ritual ends[12] or if they should proclaim (the drinking of Soma?), one should try to obtain an invitation from the Gṛhapati. The Gṛhapati is Prajāpati[13]. Prajāpati then invites him.

VI. 10. *The pressing stone breaks* (353, end)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 625–626

KS. 16; PB. 9, 9, 13–14; ĀpŚS. 14, 25, 5–9; HirŚS. 15, 6, 25; VaiŚS. 21, 11; MŚS. 3, 6, 10; KŚS. 25, 12, 15–16; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 11 (no. 46); AthPr. 6, 3.

353 (end). If the pressing stone (i.e. one of the pressing stones) should break, one should praise with the Brahmasāman of Dyutāna Māruta[1]. Or if there should be an other stone, they should press with that. If they should not find it, they should make a 'stone' consisting of Udumbara or Palāśa wood and press with that. That is the expiation in that case.

VI. 11. *The soma is stolen* (354–355)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 607–610; Oertel, *Roots*, 80; Ghosh, *Fragments* 87–89

KS. 34, 3; TB. 1, 4, 7, 5–7; PB. 9, 5; ŚB. 4, 5, 10, 1–6; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 8, (no. 40); Upagranthasūtra 2, 12; BŚS. 14, 29; ĀpŚS. 14, 24, 9–21; HirŚS. 15, 6, 12–20; VaiŚS. 21, 11; MŚS. 3, 6, 3–6; KŚS. 25, 12, 17–21; ĀśvŚS. 6, 8; ŚŚS. 13, 6; AthPr. 6, 4.

354. If they should steal[1] the Soma which has not yet been bought, they should seek it till it is found. They should even run[2] to the mountain[3]. The initiated[4] should stay where he is. If they should steal Soma which has already been bought, they should use whatever (Soma) there may be obtained for the pressing. The price paid for the first Soma is also the price for this Soma (i.e. one does not officially buy it again). However, something[5] should be given to the Soma-seller, thinking: "Let our pressing not be thwarted".

If they do not find Soma (in this case), they should press out Phālguna plants with tawny panicles. Indra killed Vṛtra with the Vajra. The Soma which flowed out of his nose, became these Phālguna plants with tawny panicles. And what was produced on account of the drawing out of the omentum[6], that became Phālguna plants with red panicles. Therefore they press out the Phālguna plants with tawny panicles, since these are more suitable to be used in a sacrifice. They say: "This (pseudo-Soma) belongs to the Asuras[7], therefore it should not be pressed out (for a Soma sacrifice)". (The answer should be:) "In the beginning all here was with the Asuras. The gods placed this with themselves after their victory. Therefore it should be used for the Soma-pressing".

If they should not find this (substitute), they should press out Ūtīka plants[8]. Indra having thrown the Vajra at Vṛtra but thinking "I have not slain him" entered the Ūtīka plants. Someone whose Soma they steal loses his help (*ūti*). They find help for him (in the form of the Ūtīka). When the head of the sacrifice was cut off, the sap which streamed forth out of it became the Ūtīka plants. Therefore also they obviously press out sacrifice itself in the form of these Ūtīka plants.

If they should not find this—

355. —they should press out light-coloured grass[9]. When king Soma came to this world, then he stayed in the grasses. This is a trace[10] of him. Thus they press him out (when they press out the grasses).

If they should not find this, they should press out the Parṇa[11]. When Suparṇa fetched king Soma, then the feather which fell down became the Parṇa (leaf). That is his trace. Thus they press him out (when they press out the Parṇa).

If they should not find this, they may press out whatever plants there are. When Suparṇa fetched king Soma and broke him, then the drops which[12] fell down, became these plants. And all plants are related to Soma. That is this trace of him. Him they thereby press out.

At the morning pressing one should pour fresh milk, at the midday pressing boiled[13] milk and at the third pressing coagulated milk to (these substitutes of Soma). It is obvious that they also consume this Soma, when they consume milk, for that is the sap of all the plants.

One should give sacrificial fees. The sacrifice is fivefold[14]. As great as is the measure of the sacrifice, in this they become thereby established. Having come out of the Avabhṛtha bath he should become initiated again. As much as he intended[15] to give (as Dakṣiṇās), he should give. This is the expiation in this case.

VI. 12. *Too many or not enough verses are chanted* (356)

Śrautakośa II, 1 (S.S.), 342–343
PB, 9, 3, 7–11; Kṣudrasūtra 1, 7 (no. 37–38); MŚS. 3, 7, 1.

356. Underpraising (i.e. singing less than prescribed) is incomplete praising[1]. Overpraising is bad praising. (Praising) correctly, that is praising. If they should praise deficiently, they should praise in addition as many verses (as had been left out) in the next Stotra or they should praise on verses which have more syllables (corresponding to the number of syllables left out in the preceding Stotra). Thereby they place the excessive in the deficient, in order to make a pairing and produce offspring.

And if they should praise too much, they should leave out in their next Stotra as many verses or they should praise on verses which have a (correspondingly) lesser number of syllables. Thereby they place the deficient in the excessive or the excessive in the deficient[2] in order to make a pairing and produce offspring. He who knows thus, reproduces himself through pairing.

If they should praise deficiently, they should make the Agniṣṭoma Sāman having three *iḷās*. Two cover the leak of the sacrifice, one takes in his own position[3] (i.e. is present in his own right). If they should praise too much, they should make the Agniṣṭoma Sāman ending in a Svara. The Svara finale is deficient[4]. They make an addition, when they praise too much. If there is overpraised with one verse, that is a Virāj with hair[5]; if with two verses, that is two teats; if with three, that is milking, for the third is the milker; if with four, that is (four) teats; if with five, that is milking, for the fifth is the milker. With the sixth or the seventh, however, there is indeed overpraised.

VI. 13. *Expiations connected with the three Vedas and the expiation for all* (sarvaprāyaścitti) (357–358)

Oertel, *TCAAS* 15 (1909), 155–162; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 654–655
AB. 5, 32–34; ŚāṅkhB. 6, 10–12; ŚB. 11, 5, 8; JB. 1, 363–364; ṢadvB. 1, 5, 7–9; JUB. 3, 15–17; ChU. 4, 17; GB. 1, 3, 1–3; BŚS. 27, 4; 29, 9; ĀpŚS. 9, 16, 4–5; 14, 32, 7; HirŚS. 15, 8, 33; VaiŚS. 20, 33; MŚS. 3, 1, 1; KŚS. 25, 1, 4–12; AthPr. 4, 1.

357. Prajāpati desired to procreate. He practised austerity. He wished: "Come, let me create[1] a firm foundation. Then the creatures, who I will create[2], will here have a firm footing and they will not, walking around without a firm foothold, become confused"[3]. He created this world.

Having created these three worlds he exerted himself on them[4], he directed heat upon them. When they had become heated, three

essences[5] arose out of them: Agni from the earth, Vāyu from the intermediate world, Āditya from heaven. He now heated these essences. When they had become heated, three essences arose out of them: the Ṛgveda from Agni, the Yajurveda from Vāyu, the Sāmaveda from Āditya. He now heated these essences. When they had become heated three essences arose out of them: *bhūs* from the Ṛgveda, *bhuvas* from the Yajurveda, *svar* from the Sāmaveda. That was the essence of the threefold wisdom. So great is this all. He who knows thus obtains the world of someone who knows the threefold wisdom.

358. Now Prajāpati went up (to the highest heaven) after he had created the sacrifice. He said to the gods: "You should set up the sacrifice by means of the threefold Veda". These gods, setting up their sacrifice by means of this threefold Veda, smote away evil (and) discovered heaven. They said: "In that we, setting up the sacrifice by means of the threefold Veda, have smitten[6] away evil, we have discovered heaven. If now to-day our sacrifice here should incur damage[7], how do we have to heal it?". Prajāpati said to them: "The splendour, power, strength and essence of this threefold Veda I gave then to you (when I went up to heaven)"[8]. "I gave[9] the Vyāhṛtis (*bhūr*, *bhuvas*, *svar*). Heal it with them".

"If this sacrifice should incur damage on account of the Ṛc, you should offer in the Gārhapatya fire (saying:) *bhūs svāhā*. That is the expiation in that case. And if on account of the Yajus, you should offer in the Āgnīdhra fire (saying:) *bhuvas svāhā*. That is the expiation in that case. And if on account of the Sāman, you should offer in the Āhavanīya fire (saying:) *svas svāhā*. That is the expiation in that case. And if (on account of the Yajus) either in the Havis and animal sacrifices or in the New and Full Moon sacrifices, you should offer in the Anvāhāryapacana fire[10]. That is the expiation in that case. And if on account of something unknown, (i.e. when they say:) "Whence has this (fault) arisen"?, you should offer in the Āhavanīya fire (saying:) *bhūr bhuvas svas svāhā*. That is the expiation for all this. As one may heal something broken by putting together joint with joint, even so one who knows thus heals all this. And if someone's priest who does not know this performs the expiation, this would be like putting a poison[11] on something broken. Therefore also one should let a person who knows thus perform this expiation.

Now they say: "If now the work of the Hotṛ is performed with the Ṛc and of the Adhvaryu with the Yajus and of the Udgātṛ with the Sāman, with what is the work of the Brahman performed?" One should say: "With this threefold wisdom". Therefore also one should appoint him the Brahman priest whom one considers the best Brahman priest. He is truly the best Brahman priest who knows thus.

VI. 14. *A theoretical saṃsava of Sattrins* (359–361)

JB. 1, 342–344.

359. Now they say: "Whereas the human beings press the Soma during the first half of the month and the gods during the second half, the performers of a long sacrificial session (the Sattrins) keep pressing during the first as well as the second half. If now someone presses simultaneously with one human being, they criticize him. How much more this will be the case if one presses Soma simultaneously with both gods and human beings? How is it possible to prevent a Saṃsava of them"?[1]. One should say: "The human beings cause to thrive yonder world, cause to increase yonder world, produce yonder world in the first half". In the first half the sacrificer should know: "Hereby I cause to thrive yonder world, to increase yonder world, I produce yonder world. I am a supporter[2] of the gods". He who is a supporter of someone who is more important, does not receive harm.

On the other hand the gods cause to thrive this world, to increase this world and produce this world in the second half of the month. In the second half the sacrificer should know: "Hereby I cause to thrive this world, to increase this world and I produce this world. I am a supporter of the human beings". He who is a supporter of the more important does not receive harm.

360. Now Bhāllaveya used to say: "The gods cause to thrive this world, cause to increase this world and produce this world in the second half of the month. Therefore the creatures, animals, plants and trees become deficient[3] during the first half and during the second half they are restored[4] in a more prosperous condition". Knowing this[5] he said this. Now they say: "If they consider the distance of a day's ride by chariot[6] or a river which splits a mountain to be a condition which prevents a Saṃsava, then (the problem remains that) many Sattrins are performing a Somapressing in one and the same sacrificial shed. If they think: "Let us sacrifice as separate sacrificers" then they perform a Saṃsava. And if they think: "We perform this sacrifice for the main sacrificer (Gṛhapati, who then acts as the sole Yajamāna)", then they become separated from the sacrifice. How is it possible that they sacrifice with separate sacrificers and nevertheless do not perform a Saṃsava"?. One should say:

361. —"King Soma is breath[7]. In that after having pressed king Soma with pressing stones in the Havirdhāna shed they take separate ladles, keep the Pravaras separated and perform their sacrificial duties separately thereby there is separately sacrificed by them. And in that this deity (i.e. breath equated with Soma) though being one and the same is

separately established[8] in creatures (without causing problems of competition), on account of that there is also no Saṃsava". He who knows what is the meaning of *saṃsava* in the Saṃsava becomes the superior of the two simultaneously sacrificing Soma-sacrificers. He who blows there (i.e. the wind) is the *saṃsava* in the Saṃsava. For all the gods follow him. Therefore plants and trees adjust themselves[9] to the direction in which the wind blows. He is also water. For when he expands[10] there is rain. He is also the room[11] between the two (simultaneously sacrificing sacrificers). He is also the mountainsplitting river which prevents a Saṃsava. Therefore also may someone who knows thus consecrate himself for the sacrifice even in the open air. He becomes the superior of the two simultaneously sacrificing Soma-sacrificers. He should worship this deity with the mantras: "You are auspicious. I throw myself down at your feet. Glory to you. Do not hurt me. He who hates me should incur injury". He who hates someone who knows thus, incurs injury.

VI. 15. *Violation of the vow of chastity* (362)

Auswahl, 130; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 646
TĀ. 2, 18; BŚS. 28, 9; ĀpŚS. 14, 29, 3; HirŚS. 15, 7, 16–17; VaiŚS. 21, 1; GautDhS. 25.

362. Now they say: "How manifold is the transition of (the powers of) someone who has spilt his semen in spite of a sacrificial vow?". One should say: "Fourfold". Indeed, he who spills his seed during a vow has a fourfold transition. He enters Indra with his force, the Maruts with his breath, Bṛhaspati with his splendour of a Brahmin scholar, Agni with everything else. Then his seed remains. The expiation for this is the following. In the night of the new moon he should put fuel on the sacred fire, surround it with grass, pour water around it and offer these two libations, (reciting) "I have spilt my seed through passion, I have become spilt, o Desire, on account of desire, *svāhā*"; "I have become injured by desire, I have become injured, o Desire, on account of desire, *svāhā*". Having folded his hands he should worship three times: "The Maruts, Indra and Bṛhaspati should pour me together. Agni should pour me together with life and strength. He should make my lifetime long". When he says: "The Maruts should pour me together," the Maruts again give breath to him, if he knows thus. When he says: "Indra should pour me together", Indra gives again strength to him, if he knows thus. When he says: "Bṛhaspati should pour me together", Bṛhaspati gives to him the splendour of a Brahmin scholar, if he knows thus. When he says: "Agni should pour me together", Agni reinforces him with all the rest from which he had become deprived, after he had

spilt his seed. He pronounces these formulas thrice[1]. There are three worlds. He obtains these three worlds, he reaches a full lifetime, he wards off evil and goes to heaven.

VI. 16. *The expiation for everything without specification (sarvaprāyaścitti)* (363–364)

Oertel, *JAOS* 26 (1905), 192–196; *Śrautakośa* II, 1 (S.S.), 655
AB. 5, 32–34; ŚāṅkhB. 6, 10–12; ŚB. 11, 5, 8; JB. 1, 357–358; ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 9–19; JUB. 3, 15–17; ChU. 4, 17; GB. 1, 3, 3; BŚS. 29, 13; KŚS. 25, 1, 12.

363. The Naimiśīya performers of a great sacrificial session performed their session with Somaśuṣma as their chief participant (*gṛhapati*). Great Indra, wishing to spoil it, snatched away the sacrificial cake (*puroḍāśa*) in the form of a monkey. Now their Adhvaryu was a learned man, called Śitibāhu Aiṣakṛta. He knew that this sap and juice pressed out[1] from the threefold was the expiation for all, namely *bhūr, bhuvas, svaḥ*[2]. These sacred exclamations are all-expiatory. Just as in ordinary life the ocean is endless, infinite, imperishable (as well as) heaven and earth, all these worlds, even so these exclamations are imperishable,—

364. —inexhaustible, endless. *bhūs* is this world, *bhuvas* the intermediate world, *svar* heaven. These are the exclamations. From Śitibāhu Aiṣakṛta, the Naimiśa, who knew this, namely that these exclamations are these Vedas[3], the monkey snatched away the sacrificial cake. He spoke: "Having taken four ladles of melted butter shall I give[4] it or shall I offer it into the fire?". He (Indra, the monkey) said: "That you (may do) in this way or in that way, but when you recited the formulas (belonging to these four ladles of melted butter), there was as expiation[5] for this, namely: "The monkey will snatch away the *puroḍāśa* cake". He (Śitibāhu) said: "I would like to be more excellent, in that I either give[4] or offer into the fire the *prāyaścitti* (libation) for something unknown and un. . . .[6]". He (Indra, the monkey) said: "Let me accept it as a gift. Do not offer it as a libation"[7]. He (Indra) accepted it. When therefore one has a Brahman priest who knows thus, one's sacrifice becomes elevated in the south and sloping[8] (to the north) for him whose Brahman priest knows thus[9] and who knows it being thus, and who knows it being thus.